

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, April 29, 1985

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WRIGHT].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, April 25, 1985.

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM WRIGHT to act as Speaker pro tempore on Monday, April 29, 1985.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Enable us, O loving God, to see the glory of Your creation—the friendships that bring us together and the bonds that unite us, the gifts of liberty and freedom, the opportunities for justice and peace. With all the tasks about us, may we not lose sight of the vision that You have given—a vision where people help each other in respect and kindness and where no nation seeks war any more. In Your holy name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas, 158, nays 130, answered "present" 3, not voting 142, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—158

Ackerman	Ford (TN)	Natcher
Akaka	Fowler	Nichols
Alexander	Prost	Nowak
Anderson	Gaydos	Oakar
Andrews	Gibbons	Olin
Annunzio	Glickman	Panetta
Anthony	Gonzalez	Pease
Applegate	Gray (IL)	Pepper
AuCoin	Guarini	Perkins
Barnard	Hall (OH)	Pickle
Bates	Hall, Ralph	Price
Bedell	Hall, Sam	Rahall
Bennett	Hamilton	Ray
Berman	Hatcher	Reid
Boner (TN)	Hertel	Richardson
Bonior (MI)	Holt	Robinson
Bonker	Horton	Rose
Broomfield	Howard	Rowland (GA)
Brown (CA)	Hoyer	Roybal
Bruce	Huckaby	Sabo
Bryant	Hughes	Schumer
Burton (CA)	Hutto	Sharp
Byron	Jenkins	Sisisky
Chappell	Jones (NC)	Slattery
Clay	Jones (TN)	Smith (IA)
Coleman (TX)	Kanjorski	Solarz
Collins	Kaptur	Spratt
Cooper	Kastenmeier	Staggers
Daniel	Kildee	Stallings
Darden	Kiecicka	Stark
Daschle	Kostenmayer	Stenholm
de la Garza	LaFalce	Stratton
DeLay	Leath (TX)	Swift
Dicks	Lehman (FL)	Synar
Dingell	Levin (MI)	Tauzin
Dixon	Levine (CA)	Thomas (GA)
Dorgan (ND)	Long	Torres
Dowdy	Lowry (WA)	Torricelli
Downey	Lukens	Trafficant
Dwyer	Lundine	Vento
Dyson	Martinez	Visclosky
Early	Matsui	Watkins
Eckart (OH)	Mavroules	Wheat
Edgar	Mazzoli	Whitley
Edwards (CA)	McCurdy	Williams
English	McHugh	Wirth
Evans (IL)	Mica	Wolpe
Fasell	Mineta	Wright
Fazio	Mollohan	Wyden
Feighan	Montgomery	Yates
Flippo	Morrison (CT)	Yatron
Florio	Mrazek	Young (MO)
Foglietta	Murtha	

NAYS—130

Armey	Dickinson	Kolbe
Bartlett	DioGuardi	Kramer
Barton	Dorman (CA)	Lagomarsino
Bateman	Dreier	Latta
Bereuter	Duncan	Leach (IA)
Billakis	Edwards (OK)	Lewis (CA)
Bliley	Emerson	Lewis (FL)
Boulter	Evans (IA)	Lightfoot
Brown (CO)	Fawell	Livingston
Broyhill	Fiedler	Lowery (CA)
Burton (IN)	Frenzel	Lungren
Callahan	Gallo	Mack
Chapple	Gekas	Marlenee
Cheney	Gilman	Martin (IL)
Clinger	Gradison	McCaIn
Coats	Green	McCandless
Cobey	Gunderson	McDade
Coble	Hammerschmidt	McEwen
Coleman (MO)	Hawkins	McGrath
Combest	Hendon	McKernan
Conte	Henry	McMillan
Coughlin	Hiller	Meyers
Courter	Hillis	Molnari
Craig	Hopkins	Monson
Daub	Ireland	Moore
Davis	Kasich	Moorhead
DeWine	Kindness	Morrison (WA)

Myers	Schaefer	Stangeland
Nielson	Schroeder	Strang
O'Brien	Schuette	Stump
Parris	Schulze	Sundquist
Pashayan	Sensenbrenner	Tauke
Penny	Shaw	Thomas (CA)
Porter	Shumway	Vander Jagt
Pursell	Shuster	Walker
Regula	Sikorski	Weber
Ridge	Slaughter	Whitehurst
Roberts	Smith (NH)	Whitten
Rogers	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Roth	Smith, Denny	Wortley
Roukema	Smith, Robert	Young (AK)
Rowland (CT)	Snowe	Zschau
Rudd	Snyder	
Saxton	Solomon	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Gejdenson	Mitchell	Smith (FL)
-----------	----------	------------

NOT VOTING—142

Addabbo	Goodling	Ortiz
Archer	Gordon	Owens
Aspin	Gray (PA)	Oxley
Atkins	Gregg	Packard
Badham	Grotberg	Petri
Barnes	Hansen	Quillen
Beilenson	Hartnett	Rangel
Bentley	Hayes	Rinaldo
Bevill	Hefner	Ritter
Biaggi	Heftel	Rodino
Boehlert	Hubbard	Roe
Boggs	Hunter	Roemer
Boland	Hyde	Rostenkowski
Borski	Jacobs	Russo
Bosco	Jeffords	Savage
Boucher	Johnson	Scheuer
Boxer	Jones (OK)	Schneider
Breaux	Kemp	Selberling
Brooks	Kennelly	Shelby
Bustamante	Kolter	Siljander
Campbell	Lantos	Skeen
Carney	Lehman (CA)	Skelton
Carper	Leland	Smith (NE)
Carr	Lent	Spence
Chandler	Lipinski	St Germain
Coelho	Lloyd	Stokes
Conyers	Loeffler	Studds
Coyne	Lott	Sweeney
Crane	Lujan	Swindall
Crockett	MacKay	Tallon
Dannemeyer	Madigan	Taylor
Dellums	Manton	Towns
Derrick	Markey	Traxler
Donnelly	Martin (NY)	Udall
Durbin	McCollum	Valentine
Dymally	McKinney	Volkmer
Eckert (NY)	Michel	Vucanovich
Erdreich	Mikulski	Walgren
Fields	Miller (CA)	Waxman
Fish	Miller (OH)	Weaver
Foley	Miller (WA)	Weiss
Ford (MI)	Moakley	Whittaker
Frank	Moody	Wilson
Franklin	Murphy	Wise
Fuqua	Neal	Wylie
Garcia	Nelson	Young (FL)
Gephardt	Oberstar	
Gingrich	Obey	

□ 1220

Mr. WALKER and Mr. DREIER of California changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DELAY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO SUBMIT A PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution at the desk.

Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution that I sent to the desk.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. No; the gentlewoman cannot with a privileged resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. Did the gentlewoman ask for a privileged resolution or resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. One may lead to the other.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order.

The Chair had recognized the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], who has sent a privileged report to the desk.

Has the gentleman from California quite finished with his request?

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe that my motion has the highest privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will be recognized in due course, if the gentlewoman will—

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. But I believe my motion has precedence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman was not—

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe that my motion has precedence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will be recognized.

The gentlewoman will state her privileged motion.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman does state a privileged motion, and the question is on the gentlewoman's motion.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 124, nays 168, not voting 141, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—124

Arney
Bartlett

Barton
Bateman

Bilirakis
Bliley

Boulter
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Callahan
Chapple
Cheney
Clinger
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combust
Conte
Coughlin
Courtner
Craig
Daub
Davis
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gilman
Green
Gunderson
Hendon
Henry
Hiller

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Andrews
Annunzio
Applegate
AuCoin
Barnard
Bates
Bedell
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Byron
Chappell
Clay
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Cooper
Darden
Daschle
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
English
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frost

Hillis
Holt
Horton
Ireland
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lowery (CA)
Lungren
Mack
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
McCain
McCandless
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McKernan
McMillan
Meyers
Monson
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Myers
Nielson
O'Brien
Parris
Pashayan
Penny
Porter

NAYS—168

Gaydos
Gedjenson
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gray (IL)
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hertel
Hopkins
Howard
Hoyer
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kildee
Kleczka
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Leath (TX)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Long
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lundine
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCurdy
McHugh
Mica
Mineta
Mitchell
Mollinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek

Pursell
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rudd
Saxton
Schaefer
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Solomon
Stangeland
Strang
Sundquist
Tauke
Thomas (CA)
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whitehurst
Wolf
Wortley
Young (AK)
Zschau

Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Obey
Olin
Owens
Panetta
Pease
Perkins
Pickle
Price
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Reid
Richardson
Robinson
Rose
Roth
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Sabo
Schroeder
Schumer
Sharp
Sikorski
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Snyder
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stratton
Stump
Swift
Synar
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torrice
Traficant
Vento
Visclosky
Walgren
Watkins
Wheat
Whitley

Whitten
Williams
Wirth

Wolpe
Wright
Wyden

Yates
Yatron
Young (MO)

NOT VOTING—141

Addabbo
Anderson
Anthony
Archer
Aspin
Atkins
Badham
Barnes
Beilenson
Bentley
Bevill
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boggs
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Bustamante
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Coelho
Conyers
Coyne
Crane
Crockett
Daniel
Dannemeyer
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Donnelly
Durbin
Dymally
Eckert (NY)
Erdreich
Fields
Fish
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Franklin

Fuqua
Garcia
Gephardt
Gingrich
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (PA)
Gregg
Grotberg
Hansen
Hartnett
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel
Hubbard
Hunter
Hyde
Jacobs
Jeffords
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Kennelly
Koltz
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Leland
Lent
Lipinski
Lloyd
Loeffler
Lott
Lujan
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markley
Martin (NY)
McCollum
McKinney
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Moakley
Moody

Neal
Nelson
Oberstar
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pepper
Petri
Quillen
Rinaldo
Ritter
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rostenkowski
Russo
Savage
Scheuer
Schneider
Seiberling
Shelby
Siljander
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Solaz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Stokes
Studds
Sweeney
Swindall
Tallon
Taylor
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Volkmer
Waxman
Weaver
Weiss
Whittaker
Wilson
Wise
Wylie
Young (FL)

□ 1240

Mr. BATES changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. PORTER, DREIER of California, KOLBE, THOMAS of California, BOULTER, and MCCAIN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SWINDALL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained so as to miss rollcall votes 76 and 77. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 76 and "yea" on rollcall No. 77.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained earlier today and missed two recorded votes, Nos. 76 and 77.

On rollcall No. 76 on the Journal, I would have voted "no."

If I had been here on rollcall No. 77, a motion to adjourn, I would have voted "no" also.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF INDIANA

Mr. PANETTA, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-58) on the resolution (H. Res. 146) relating to election of a Representative from the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA), laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 26, 1985.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5, Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit sealed envelopes received from the White House as follows:

(1) At 11:15 a.m. on Friday, April 26, 1985 and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits a report on United States participation in the United Nations; and

(2) At 11:15 a.m. on Friday, April 26, 1985 and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits reports and recommendations on proposed inclusions and exclusions from the Wild and Scenic River System and Wilderness System.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS ON PROPOSED INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS FROM THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVER SYSTEM AND WILDERNESS SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-59)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of Friday, April 26, 1985, at page 9602.)

□ 1250

REPORT ON COSTS AND BENEFITS OF U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of Friday, April 26, 1985, page 9603.)

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1612

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from California, Mr. GLENN ANDERSON be taken off the cosponsor list for the bill, H.R. 1612.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that Senate Joint Resolution 106 entitled "Joint resolution to approve the obligation of funds available under Public Law 98-473 for supporting military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua," passed the Senate.

LET US EDUCATE OURSELVES ON THE ISSUE AND THEN VOTE TO DECLARE INDIANA'S EIGHTH DISTRICT SEAT VACANT

(Mr. FRENZEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, by agreement announced last Thursday, it is expected that there will be a motion tomorrow made to declare the seat in Indiana's Eighth Congressional District vacant. On Wednesday, there will be a preferential motion from the House Administration Committee to declare candidate McCloskey the winner.

This is an important issue on which I hope all Members will make themselves informed. The committee report will be published. It is an extensive report.

I would like to invite the Members' attention to the minority remarks, which I think are compelling and persuasive. I hope that Members of the majority group, especially, will find their way that far through the account.

This is going to be one of the most important votes that we have ever had

in the House. It deals with the foundations of representative government. I hope that all Members will make themselves aware of all of the facts, rather than read press releases, for their information on this vital issue.

I hope Members will vote to declare the seat vacant on Tuesday, and I hope they will have the opportunity to do so.

LET US NOT RULE OUT ANY FOREIGN POLICY OPTIONS IN REGARDS TO NICARAGUA

(Mr. GLICKMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I voted against military aid to the Contras because I did not believe that it is historically—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is reading from a paper in violation of rule XXX.

Mr. GLICKMAN. The gentleman was not reading from the paper, but I will proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against military aid because I do not think it is consistent for the United States to engage itself in direct action to undermine another government by trying to overthrow it militarily. I do not think that the Sandinista regime should take any refuge in my votes or any other Members of Congress votes, and in fact most of the votes of the Democratic Party. When we saw Mr. Ortega visit the Soviet Union and embrace Soviet leaders in order to get significant support in that country, I think that that visit is going to be viewed very unfavorably by a majority of House Democrats. I personally would not object to us considering the imposition of trade sanctions or even considering the possibility of recalling our Ambassador if, in fact, it appears that the Sandinista regime is insistent upon interfering in the activities of other countries.

My only point in all of this, Mr. Speaker, is to say that while we have an Ambassador in Nicaragua, and while we recognize that country and have dealings with them, it should not in any way rule out the kind of foreign policy options to let the Sandinistas know that we expect them to honor the integrity of other nations.

LISTEN TO WHAT IS GOING ON

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is nice to see the previous speaker starting to backtrack on behalf of the Democrat Party after

their horrendous vote last week against aiding the Contras in any way in Central America.

This weekend, we all saw on national television Daniel Ortega being embraced by a member of the Communist Politburo in Moscow, kissing him on both cheeks, and asking for \$200 million in economic aid. Of course, he wants that economic aid because he feels we might impose an embargo of some type in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I can hear him also whispering to the leadership in Moscow: "Will you give me a little military aid, too? We have all kinds of allies in the Congress; we have defeated the Yankees in the Congress of the United States. Now we have a clear field ahead of us, all I need is a little more military aid and we can expand that revolution into El Salvador, into Honduras, into Guatemala and ultimately into Mexico."

Mr. Speaker, if we do not do something in this House, if we do not watch what is going on on television and listen to the Communists, our boys are going to be involved in a military conflict in Central America that is totally unnecessary.

Listen to what is going on, Democrats; listen to what is going on.

THEY MIGHT GET THE MESSAGE

(Mr. COBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, today's newspaper editions reveal sordid facts of what may be repeat performances of questionable and inexcusable subversion of claims against the Pentagon by defense contractors. A team of auditors uncovered \$109.7 million in what was described as "absolutely inexcusable" claims against the Pentagon.

How many more of these exercises must be endured before the wrongdoers get the message that this sort of fun and games with taxpayers' money will not be eternally tolerated?

We need additional information in the event the media accounts are inaccurate but if these reports do reflect accuracy my conclusion is, enough is enough. Let us do more than gently slap the hands of these greedy grabbers of taxpayer's money. Perhaps if they heard the slamming of a prison cell door, they might get the message.

ONE OF THE GREATEST SHOWS ON EARTH

(Mr. CRAIG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, you are ringmaster over one of the greatest

shows on Earth, one that has brought a great deal of entertainment to the American public over the last several months.

The great sleight of hand that has occurred in this body in failing to recognize the proper Representative from the Eighth District of Indiana would have P.T. Barnum and the Ringling Brothers standing in awe at the kind of activities that the House has conducted.

Tuesday, we will have the opportunity to give the citizens of the Eighth District of Indiana a chance to select in a fair and honest election process, as they did once upon a time ago, a Representative.

I think the citizens of that district deserve an opportunity to be represented in this Congress. Mr. Ringmaster, I hope the Members of the Democratic Party recognize that also.

□ 1300

ORTEGA PILGRIMAGE TO MOSCOW

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, no sooner did the U.S. Congress vote to deny aid to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua, than the Marxist leader of the country, Daniel Ortega, began preparing a victory pilgrimage to Moscow. While the ink was still drying on news reports of this dramatic display of ostrich-like behavior by the Congress in voting to deny \$14 million in humanitarian aid to the Contras, Ortega was boldly announcing his plans to visit the Soviet Union and Eastern bloc countries in a quest for an additional \$200 million in aid for his Communist regime.

I have lived and worked in Central America. During my recent visit to the region, the people repeatedly told me that aid to the Contras was vital to their free survival. Apparently, the Congress did not heed their strongly expressed desires.

These neighboring peoples to Nicaragua are convinced—as I am—that if we permit the Ortega government to consolidate its position, the export of communism to the rest of Central America will be inevitable.

No one won last week on the vote to deny aid to the Contras, including the majority who wished it.

In the wake of this defeat for freedom and democracy in our hemisphere, and to help prevent the establishment of a second Communist beachhead—or another Cuba—in the region, I strongly suggest this administration and the Congress reassess its ties and relations and favorable trade with Nicaragua, recall our Ambassador and discontinue trade with Nicaragua.

CREDIBILITY OF CONGRESS IS ON THE LINE

(Mr. HILLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have not looked forward to this week. I have not looked forward to returning to a Chamber filled with so much partisanship. I have not looked forward to watching as the majority party steamrolls the minority and tells a half million of my fellow Hoosiers that they have no right to decide who should represent them in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the impact a decision to seat Mr. McCloskey will have on the future of the 99th Congress and our efforts to pass badly needed deficit-reduction and tax reform legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I propose that the House convene a nonpartisan blue ribbon commission comprised of some of America's top educators and political scientists to study the handling of the eighth district race and supply this body with recommendations which will avoid such occurrences in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there are lessons to be learned and precedents which have been set which need to be reviewed in a nonpolitical atmosphere. Clearly, we need to establish a set of rules to govern unfortunate situations such as this. These rules should be known in advance, not constructed in the heat of a political battle for the purpose of swelling the ranks of the majority at the expense of the minority.

The threat our actions will have this week on our democratic system is apparent and this is all the more reason to look at this situation closely.

Our credibility is on the line, Mr. Speaker. Will we act to protect it?

NINTH ANNUAL SWEET POTATO AFFAIR

(Mrs. LONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on April 25 congressional Members held our Ninth Annual Sweet Potato Luncheon. Senator RUSSELL LONG and I cohosted this luncheon and it has been our privilege in the Louisiana delegation to do this for 9 years.

Thanks to our fine farmers, we have a bumper sweet potato harvest, and as a result, the Government is using great quantities of sweet potatoes in its programs for the military and for schoolchildren. Since the major concern of these programs is to provide food with a high nutritional value and tasty flavor, the Louisiana yam is custom made.

I encourage the Department of Agriculture to continue to purchase yams for their programs and to give us adequate time so that we can make decisions on purchasing and have our planning done correctly.

The Louisiana yam is one of the most nutritious foods there are, and we are very proud in Louisiana and the other Southern States which grow them of the wonderful job that our farmers do in providing our country with such a wonderful product.

PRESIDENTIAL VIOLATIONS OF WAR POWERS ACT

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. During these 1 minute opportunities I have been discussing the violations of the War Powers Act by the President.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the gentleman is reading from a paper in violation of rule XXX.

Ms. OAKAR. Will the gentleman yield on that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The gentleman from Texas may proceed without reading.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Absolutely. Frankly, I prefer it that way. I just cannot guarantee the gentleman 1 minute, if the gentleman will join me in a unanimous-consent request to address the House for anything up to 1 hour.

Mr. Speaker, seriously speaking, I think this is a matter of such grave import that I have been rising periodically weekly to specifically point out the violations by the President of the United States of the War Powers Limitation Act of 1974.

□ 1310

I think every Member of us always wants to cooperate with a President, be he who he might. But I have from the beginning maintained the independence that I think the Constitution gives this branch of the Government, and whether it is John Kennedy or Lyndon Johnson or Richard Nixon or Jerry Ford or Jimmy Carter or President Ronald Reagan, if I believe they are wrong, I say so and I will not vote in accordance with their wishes.

In this case the President has, I submit, in act after act violated the War Powers Limitation Act. I will respect him and follow him when he stops violating the law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has expired.

AMERICA'S NEW POOR: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed about the emergence—

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The gentleman is using a script, but I will not object because I think it is rather petty to do that. You may proceed and use your notes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her permission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed about the emergence of a new economic under class—America's new poor. I speak of our children and young people.

Senator MOYNIHAN recently observed that Government programs have virtually eliminated poverty among the Nation's aged. He labeled this "the extraordinary achievement of the era." I agree. But, in the meantime, what has been happening to our children?

Who lives in extreme poverty—in households which last year had incomes of less than \$3,600? Just 2.5 percent of all senior citizen households fit this description. But 12 percent of the households headed by young people, under age 25, suffer incomes this low. Many of these families include small children.

One would think Federal means-tested cash benefit programs would reflect these numbers. They don't. Young families may have an extreme poverty rate five times that for senior citizens, but their percentage of households receiving these funds—supposedly targeted on the poor—is exactly the same: 11 percent.

What we have done for the elderly is indeed an extraordinary achievement. What we are doing to our children is an extraordinary tragedy.

VIEWING OF TASK FORCE PROCEEDINGS ON INDIANA ELECTION CONTEST SCHEDULED

(Mr. ROSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, beginning this afternoon at 2 o'clock over the House of Representatives in-house television system, the House Broadcasting System will begin showing the first half of approximately 9 hours and 6 minutes of videotapes of the elections task force meeting in Evansville, IN.

The tapes will not constitute an official record of the task force or committee proceedings, and the proceedings were actually filmed by and the tapes provided by the National Republican Congressional Committee. These tapes will be about 9 hours and 6 minutes of a total of 28 hours and 43 minutes of public task force and committee deliberations. They do not contain

a full record of all the discussion of any of the issues decided. The Speaker of the House has agreed that these tapes will be shown, as he was requested by the minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We on the minority side are delighted that this broadcast will begin. At the Speaker's request, there will be a disclaimer showing that the films were indeed made by and are the property of the National Republican Congressional Committee. The gentleman from North Carolina has graciously guaranteed that this videotape, which is the property of its owner, will not be copied by the Architect or the House Broadcasting System.

I would take this time to remind the Members that those of you who have VCR equipment in your offices got it under the rules that any use of it will be for your own personal use exclusively, and that any transfer to other parties by lease, sale, or gift or for any other purposes is expressly forbidden. It is the desire of the owners of these tapes, and in accordance with the House rules, as nearly as I can figure, that they be used for the education of House Members exclusively, and I would ask the gentleman from North Carolina whether that is his understanding in this matter.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding. The gentleman has stated it correctly.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSE. I will be happy to yield in just 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, just to repeat, we will begin at 2 o'clock this afternoon on channel 6 of our in-house cable system the first 4½ hours, and then at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning we will begin the last half of approximately 4½ hours.

I now yield briefly to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I am wondering, just as a matter of curiosity, why on Earth would anyone object to taping something that is purported to be a full and accurate representation of those meetings?

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for the campaign committee, but they have spent a lot of money making these things, and I guess they want to sell them. They just do not want to give them away to anybody, and if you would like to copy them and look at them for your own use, that is OK, but it is not OK for you to use them commercially without the

permission of the Republican Campaign Committee.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROSE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, our rule, of course, applies to everything.

Mr. ROSE. Absolutely.

Mr. FRENZEL. It does not apply just to this venture. But because the owner was concerned in this case, I thought it was appropriate to remind the House of the general House rule with respect to the use of VCR.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, my curiosity dealt with the motive of the owner. Why would the owner object to the taping?

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to pursue that at another time. I am simply trying to comply with the Speaker's request as it was worked out with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], and the gentleman has correctly stated our agreement.

THE QUEST FOR TRUTH IN THE INDIANA ELECTION CONTEST

(Mr. STRANG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, the facts in the case in Indiana's Eighth Congressional District are clear. The citizens of that sovereign State sent a certified winner here. No contest or protest was registered in Indiana, even by the loser, Mr. McCloskey. No evidence of fraud or voting irregularity has been claimed.

Yet Mr. Speaker, this House has chosen to trash Indiana law, disenfranchise its voters, ignore its own procedures, and seat one who never contested his loss.

In its quest for truth, this body has prosecuted its pledge "to count all the votes" by counting only some of the votes, by not counting some absentee votes, some cast by the military, and in at least, one instance, counting more votes than there were voters in the precinct.

Mr. Speaker, truth, justice, honor, and respect for the citizens have been cast aside by reckless partisan power politics.

Mr. Speaker, let us turn back from this shameful travesty.

MONROE DOCTRINE TO BE CITED ON INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much concerned as a Member of Congress who comes from an area where the Monroe Doctrine had its beginnings that we are not really doing what we should be doing with regard to that announcement and what it implies in our day. Therefore, I have constructed a resolution on this matter and will be introducing it today or tomorrow.

MCCLOSKEY-McINTYRE DISPUTE HINGES ON PHILOSOPHICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN POLITICAL PARTIES

(Mr. MACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, the debate over seating Rick McIntyre or Frank McCloskey is the classic example of the difference between the two parties' philosophies.

One, the Democrats believe that all direction, all power, and all decisions emanate from Washington. That Washington is the center of the Nation. So it is natural for the Democrats to fill the vacant seat by appointing Frank McCloskey as Washington representative to Indiana.

The other philosophy, the Republicans, believe that all direction, all power, and all decisions emanate from the people. That Washington exists only by permission of the people. So it is natural for Republicans to fill the vacant seat by accepting the peoples representative from Indiana to Washington.

So go ahead, make your appointment from on high. But remember what our great President Abraham Lincoln said:

If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all the time; but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

You haven't fooled the people of Indiana. Rick McIntyre will eventually be seated in this House.

□ 1320

MR. PRESIDENT, FOR YOUR SAKE AND OURS, CANCEL BITBURG

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's leader should exemplify its highest morality. Sadly, Ronald Reagan appears to have lost his moral bearings, but the American people have not. They can distinguish readily between Hitler's Nazi Germany and the West Germany of today. They re-

member clearly who were the executioners and who the victims as clearly as they know the difference between good and evil.

It is truly ironic that in this sad season of remembrance, those careless, and unmindful of history would diminish the slaughter of millions.

I do not doubt that the President is genuinely anguished over the furor set off by his scheduled visit to Bitburg Cemetery. There is still time to ease that anguish. Mr. President, for your sake and ours, cancel Bitburg.

CAULDRON BUBBLE TO THE TOP

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, let justice be done. If you will not seat Rick McIntyre, please use your sense of integrity and that spirit of fair play that you respect, and the reputation that you have built up over three decades of public service to make sure that there is a new election, a free election held again in the Eighth District of Indiana. Let's fight it out in the precincts, the way you like, fair and square.

I will be joining most of the Members at 2 o'clock to watch the Evansville, IN, "Voters Chainsaw Massacre," courtesy of the majority party.

For those of you who think there is any humor in the McIntyre affair, or believe our hurt and rage is not deeply felt, I invite you, including you, Mr. Speaker, to come over to our Cloakroom, to talk to us in the spirit of camaraderie and comity. You must come to understand that we truly are outraged over here on this side and that this affront to fairness will poison this House for 1 year and 5 months. Until we adjourn on or about October 1, 1986, this Congress will be a needlessly bitter Chamber. So senseless, when justice cries out for a new eighth district election in Indiana.

A change of subject, Mr. Speaker. "Round about the cauldron go; in the poisoned entrails throw. * * * double, double, toil and trouble; fire burn and cauldron bubble. * * * Like a hell-broth boil and bubble." That's what we have here, Mr. Speaker, double toil and trouble.

Daniel Dillinger Ortega, the famous bank robber from Central America, is now openly soliciting protection money from the Soviets and virtually all the Communist countries of East Europe. The rumor in the discos of Leningrad and Moscow, all two of them, is that he is asking not for \$200 million in lethal aid, but rather for \$214 million of Communist money. Get the symbolism, \$200 million plus \$14 million, so that he can derisively sneer all the way to the bank. It will

not be so humorous, for many in this Congress, when the freedom fighters that we set in motion, the Contras, or Contra-tyrants, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Hyde] boldly refers to them, are massacred by Soviet "Mi-24D "Hind" gunships. There will be another song sung around here if that slaughter takes place, a dirge of mourning over betrayal. If that betrayal befalls the democratic resistance in Nicaragua, then the majority party will truly have ordained a new mascot for themselves—an ostrich with its head buried in the sands of dishonor.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. See you in the Cloakroom.

CONDEMNING PRESIDENT ORTEGA'S TRIP TO SOVIET UNION

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, to the State Department authorization bill, I will be introducing a resolution as an amendment which would strongly condemn President Ortega's trip to the Soviet Union, as well as his insufficient gesture of reducing Cuban advisers from 2,500 by approximately 100. He released 100 advisers and I think that is clearly insufficient.

It shows, first of all, an act of bad faith on his part, especially to those Members of Congress that voted against military aid to the Contras. In addition to that, it shows a lack of understanding of the American political process.

The message to Mr. Ortega is that we want peace in Central America through negotiations, not through more ties with the Soviets and Cubans.

I believe this provision will strongly state from the Congress of the United States to Mr. Ortega that we want peace, that we do not like his actions, that there will be some options that this country and this Congress, along with the President, will consider if he continues this course of militarizing the area and of doing exactly the things that many Members of Congress here thought were inappropriate.

THE F-16 AND THE F-20

(Mr. COURTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, there are two jet airplanes that are quite comparable, the F-16 and the F-20. Both have very modern radar, both have avionics systems that are quite similar. They both have excellent performance in air-to-air fighter combat capability modes. They have accurate air-to-ground bombing systems.

There are differences between the two planes, between the F-16 and the F-20. The F-16 probably has a greater range and also can carry more ordinance.

The F-20 apparently is better in the reliability and maintainability area.

I believe and a lot of other people believe that it is important that the Department of Defense and the Air Force procure some F-20's in order to have a year-by-year competition between these two planes.

There was, a couple of years ago, a second source for fighter engine aircraft. The Air Force made the determination that that competition on a yearly basis is going to save taxpayers about \$4 billion.

I believe that a similar competition between the F-20 and the F-16 will lead to significant savings for the American taxpayer. In that regard, I will be introducing an amendment in the subcommittee in the Armed Services Committee today in order to procure some F-20's. If unsuccessful there, I hope that the Congress will support our endeavor on the floor of the House when the authorization bill comes forward.

VACATING EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL SEAT IN INDIANA

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow there is going to be a resolution before this House to vacate the congressional seat of the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana.

In a letter dated April 29, task force chairman LEON PANETTA has outlined pros and cons of the situation as he sees it in Indiana.

□ 1330

I would ask that each Member of this House review that document before deciding what to do tomorrow. On page 2 of that document, under the headline, "Counting Rules," it says one of the primary goals of the task force was to disenfranchise the smallest number of voters possible.

It is a sad state of affairs in this Nation's history when, as a primary goal, we have to disenfranchise anybody.

If we vote not to vacate that seat and then, on Wednesday, vote to seat Mr. McCloskey, in all probability we have set a precedent where we could disenfranchise every voter in this country.

I would urge the Members to review the Panetta document, to review the tapes, and then tomorrow let us vote to vacate the seat and let the voters of the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana decide for themselves who they want to be their Congressman.

THE ELECTION IN INDIANA'S EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, several times during the debate to seat Rick McIntyre over the last 4 months, the issue has been raised whether this body has the right to seat its own Members. Mr. Speaker, I question this right as it pertains to an election contest in the Eighth District of Indiana.

Our Founding Fathers wrote article I, section 5, subsection 1, into our Constitution to protect this body from extraordinary circumstances. I do not believe that extraordinary circumstances exist in this case.

These extraordinary circumstances that our Founding Fathers tried to anticipate were circumstances such as a State refusing to send a Representative, or election fraud, or a Member that does not meet the moral standards of this body.

There are no extraordinary circumstances in this case, Mr. Speaker. There are no charges of election fraud. There are no charges of moral turpitude on the part of Rick McIntyre.

The people of Indiana have sent a Representative to this body. Indiana election laws were followed, not only on election night but in the subsequent recount.

The right to seat our Members was never intended and should never be intended to write election laws for our States. Our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution to provide us with a set of rules to be governed by, not a set of rules to be ignored for convenience and for the theft of a seat.

THE ELECTION IN INDIANA'S EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

(Mr. COBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Speaker, count the rhetoric and count the ballots. That was the cry of Democrats in Congress last January when they refused to seat the certified winner of Indiana's Eighth Congressional District, Republican Rick McIntyre.

Instead, they appointed a task force controlled by Democrats to conduct their own recount.

Last week, the recount stopped when Democrat Frank McCloskey reached a 4-vote lead, although there were 32 votes left to count. Even the Democratic-appointed recount supervisor, James Shumway, testified that the ballots not counted were indistinguishable on a legal or security basis from

the ballots the task force had previously counted.

Now the Democrats find themselves with a historic decision. They can be fair and count all of the ballots or they can be fair and let the people of Indiana decide who won through a special election. Or they can simply seat the Democrat on the basis of a four-vote margin that they handed him in their recount.

Around the country, editorial voices are calling on Congress to put fairness above politics.

THE ELECTION IN INDIANA'S EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

(Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the Members of the House today that even in Mobile, AL, 1,021 miles from Washington, DC, it is becoming very, very well known of the tactics that are being used in this House by the Democratic majority. In a blistering editorial this morning, let me tell you that they mention in part that at least one Democrat indicates to the news media that he is not going along with this because it is right or wrong, but because it is the macho thing to do.

Let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen of the House, that you indeed can do the macho thing and vote with your leadership on this ridiculous movement. But let me tell you, with your tactics you might win this battle but you are going to lose the war.

I urge you to join with me and support an election to decide this factor, a fair election in the State of Indiana.

STRIKES AGAINST FREEDOM

(Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, last week, we voted against \$14 million to the freedom-fighting Contras in Nicaragua. Daniel Ortega then hopped a plane on his way to Moscow to pick up \$200 million.

Strike one against freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the task force, as it is called by the Democrats, then voted not to seat the individual from the Eighth District of Indiana, Mr. McIntyre, who won an election, and now are going to throw that election out and put somebody else in who did not win. Strike two.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are the managers of this team, and I know they are not going to tolerate those of us in this body striking out when it comes to freedom.

Mr. Speaker, freedom is not a game. It is time for some pinch-hitters.

AID TO THE CONTRAS IN NICARAGUA

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am anguished by the turn of events as to Nicaragua. The aid to the Contras can readily be seen as applying a tourniquet to the bleeding arm of the U.S. national security; that is, Central America.

Those of us who supported the Contras wanted to keep the pressure on with this tourniquet to prevent further bleeding of our interests in that region. But failure to render aid to the Contras is loosening that tourniquet and, you know, when Ortega visits the Soviet Union, we are in even greater danger of having that sole pressure point allow the bleeding of our special interests and of the interests of democracy in that Central American region.

The stakes are high. Costa Rica is in danger. The Hondurans are in danger. Democracy recently established in El Salvador is in danger. Mexico is in danger.

Therefore, the United States of America, our country, is in danger.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MURTHAL]. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken on Tuesday, April 30, 1985.

ACCEPTING A STATUE OF JEANNETTE RANKIN

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 37) providing for acceptance of a statue of Jeannette Rankin presented by the State of Montana for placement in National Statuary Hall, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 37

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the statue of Jeannette Rankin, presented by the State of Montana for the National Statuary Hall collection in accordance with the provisions of section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (40 U.S.C. 187), is accepted in the name of the United States, and the thanks of the Congress are tendered to the State of Montana for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent personages, the first woman elected to the United States Congress, known for her courage and convictions regarding equality and peace.

Sec. 2. The State of Montana is authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol the statue of Jeannette Rankin referred to in the first section of this concurrent resolution, and to hold ceremonies on May 1, 1985, in the rotunda on that occasion. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

Sec. 3. (a) The proceedings in the rotunda of the Capitol at the presentation by the State of Montana of the statue of Jeannette Rankin for the National Statuary Hall collection, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a Senate document. The copy for such document shall be prepared under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library.

(b) There shall be printed five thousand additional copies of such document which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, of which one hundred and three copies shall be for the use of the Senate and eighteen hundred and ninety-seven copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of Montana, and four hundred and sixty-three copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and two thousand five hundred and thirty-seven copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Montana.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution to the Governor of Montana.

□ 1340

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the ordering of the second, and on that I demand tellers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, will a second be ordered?

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker pro tempore appointed as tellers Ms. OAKAR and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

The House divided, and the tellers reported that there were—yeas 21, nays 10.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 318, nays 0, not voting 115, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—318

Ackerman	Atkins	Bereuter
Addabbo	AuCoin	Berman
Akaka	Barnard	Bevill
Alexander	Bartlett	Bilirakis
Andrews	Barton	Bliley
Anthony	Bateman	Boland
Applegate	Bates	Boner (TN)
Armey	Bedell	Bonior (MI)
Aspin	Bennett	Bonker

Boulter
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Byron
Callahan
Chapple
Cheney
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Combest
Conte
Cooper
Coughlin
Crouter
Craig
Daniel
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Dorgan (ND)
Dorman (CA)
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
English
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fasell
Fawell
Feighan
Fiedler
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Gallo
Gaydos
Gedden
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gray (IL)
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hayes
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiller
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Howard

Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Ireland
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kildee
Kindness
Kiecicka
Kolbe
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Manton
Markley
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinaro
Mollohan
Monson
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mracek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nichols
Nielsen
Nowak
O'Brien
Oskar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Owens
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Porter

Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Robinson
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Sabo
Saxton
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siskisky
Skeen
Slatery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solaz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stagers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stratton
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tausin
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wirth
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NOT VOTING—115

Anderson
Annunzio
Archer
Badham
Barnes
Bellenson
Bentley
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boggs
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Bustamante
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Coelho
Conyers
Coyne
Crane
Crockett
Dannemeyer
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Donnelly
Dunbar
Dymally
Eckart (NY)
Edwards (OK)
Erdreich
Fazio

Fields
Fish
Ford (MI)
Franklin
Fuqua
Garcia
Gephardt
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (PA)
Gregg
Grotberg
Hansen
Hawkins
Hefner
Heftel
Horton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hunter
Hyde
Jacobs
Jeffords
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kennelly
Kolter
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Lipinski
Lloyd
Loeffler
Lott
MacKay
Martin (NY)
McCollum

□ 1400

So a second was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call 78, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, each State is permitted to have two statues in Statuary Hall, and the State of Montana has wisely decided as their second statue to honor the memory of Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin, who was first elected to Congress in 1916. She was the first woman ever to be elected in Congress. And, interestingly enough, she was elected before we had the 19th amendment, which did not take place until 1920. So Montana was progressive enough to allow all of its citizens the right to vote in 1916.

Jeannette Rankin was extraordinarily well known for her work on issues related to children, very well known for issues related to equal rights for women and certainly well known for her views concerning world peace.

I think it is very fitting and appropriate that we pass this legislation. I

want to applaud the people from the State of Montana and certainly the Members from the State, particularly my colleague, Mr. WILLIAMS, for promoting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the minority has no objection to this routine resolution. It urges that in fact it be swiftly adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and I applaud her for her patience in attempting to bring this concurrent resolution to the floor.

I do not know what it is about the name of Jeannette Rankin that causes so much raucous confrontation in this Chamber. Perhaps there is a different issue than that which Jeannette used to raise when she served in this Chamber so many years ago that has caused the consternation here today. But, nonetheless, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with my colleague on the Republican side, Mr. MARLENEE, and myself, in supporting this concurrent resolution which calls for the installation of Montana's second statue here in the Capitol on May 1, to honor Jeannette Rankin.

This May 1 ceremony, this acceptance of a statue to honor Jeannette Rankin, is of tremendous significance to the people of this country because Jeannette Rankin was the first woman in the United States elected to serve in the Congress. Her first term was in 1917-18. Her second term was 1941-42. Jeannette was involved in the women's suffrage movement, out on the streets in New York City, to California and back again, to North Dakota.

When she ran for Congress in Montana, campaigning in the district which I now am pleased and proud to represent, she did so in much the same way that she first campaigned across this Nation for women's suffrage. She did so on horseback, in the kitchens of her friends, and with a direct-mail postcard effort which in those days was virtually unheard of. We Montanans shall be forever proud that we sent the first woman to Congress, a Republican, before most States had even granted women the right to vote.

Four days after Jeannette arrived here in 1917, she had to cast a vote on whether or not this Nation should enter World War I. Jeannette and 55 others that day voted "no." The next time Jeannette returned to Congress it was 1941, and one of her first duties was to vote on whether or not to agree to declare World War II. Jeannette voted "no." But this time she was not

joined by several dozen of her colleagues. Instead, she had to stand and vote "no" alone. She later noted that no one ever said it would be easy serving in this body. No one ever said it would be easy to cast these votes. I do so only because I believe it is right.

And in that first session, her best friend was Fiorello LaGuardia. The press had it that day that when Jeannette cast that first vote "no" she retired from this Chamber in tears, and so it went out across the daily newspapers that the first woman in Congress cast a difficult vote and then broke down in tears. That turned out not to be true. That evening, when the press found Fiorello LaGuardia, they said, "Congressman LaGuardia, is it true that your friend, Jeannette Rankin, was in tears after casting that vote?" And Fiorello said, "I don't know. I couldn't tell. My eyes were filled with tears."

Both between and following those votes, Jeannette spent all of her years at the grassroots lobbying for peace, for women's rights, for better working conditions for men and women, better education for children all across this country. In other words, in her words, she began to prepare America for peace.

This concurrent resolution is neither controversial nor partisan. The resolution before the Montana Legislature asking this Congress and this House to accept this second statue of Jeannette Rankin was introduced in a bipartisan fashion and was received and passed with a strong bipartisan vote. I am delighted to come to the well today and ask this House to take this historic step in again fully recognizing Jeannette Rankin, the first woman in Congress, with whom, whether we agreed or disagreed, we understood as a leader, with courage unlike that displayed by any other who ever served in this body.

□ 1410

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude the debate by stating that Jeannette Rankin is one of six women so honored in Statuary Hall. There are also six States who have not taken their total number of two statues who are allocated it, and Mr. Speaker, at this point, I do not have any more requests for time, but I hope that the values that Jeannette Rankin stood for; namely, world peace, equal rights for women, and fairness to American workers are the same values that we will have today.

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I support Senate Concurrent Resolution 37 which provides for acceptance of a statue to Jeannette Rankin. I would like to express my appreciation and deep respect for this courageous woman from Montana who broke so

many barriers for women in politics. As the first woman elected to the House of Representatives, she began the march of women into the U.S. Congress.

Her tireless campaigning for women's suffrage serves as a strong example for women concerned with justice. Women's suffrage was an important part of the platform that brought her to Congress in 1917. She crossed the entire country convincing Americans that women deserved the right to vote alongside of men. On January 10, 1918, Jeannette Rankin introduced the suffrage amendment, the year in which it finally passed the House.

She continually championed unpopular causes. She supported children's protective legislation at a time when children were considered a viable and exploitable labor source. Jeannette Rankin was the only Member of Congress who voted against America's entry into both World Wars. Even though both these votes probably led to her defeat in running for office again, she stood by her principles. She had the personal satisfaction of knowing she had remained true to herself.

Her persistence and her dauntless spirit serve as a strong example for all who believe in civil rights for all Americans.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 37), as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY IN MAY 1985

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 130) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the President's visit to the Federal Republic of Germany in May 1985.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 130

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States Government should pay honor to the memories of the millions

of innocent civilians and hundreds of thousands of American and Allied soldiers who suffered and died at the hands of the Nazis;

(2) on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War it is fitting and appropriate for the President, in a gesture of reconciliation, to visit the Federal Republic of Germany, a country which has taken its place among the community of democratic nations and which is now a friend and ally of the United States;

(3) the President should recognize the importance of the relationship between our Nation and the Federal Republic of Germany by paying tribute to appropriate symbols of that nation's current democracy; and

(4) the President should reconsider the inclusion of the Bitburg Cemetery in his forthcoming trip to the Federal Republic of Germany.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the ordering of the second and on that I demand tellers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will a second be ordered?

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker pro tempore appointed as tellers Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. FASCELL.

The House divided, and the tellers reported that there were—yeas 37, nays 10.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 325, nays 1, answered "present" 1, not voting 106, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—325

Ackerman	Broomfield	Darden
Addabbo	Brown (CA)	Daschle
Akaka	Brown (CO)	Daub
Alexander	Broyhill	Davis
Anderson	Bruce	de la Garza
Andrews	Bryant	DeLay
Annunzio	Burton (IN)	DeWine
Anthony	Byron	Dickinson
Applegate	Callahan	Dicks
Arney	Campbell	Dingell
Aspin	Chappell	DioGuardi
Atkins	Chappie	Dixon
AuCoin	Cheney	Dorgan (ND)
Barnard	Clay	Dorman (CA)
Bartlett	Clinger	Dowdy
Bateman	Coats	Downey
Bates	Cobey	Dreier
Bedell	Coble	Duncan
Bennett	Coleman (MO)	Dwyer
Bereuter	Coleman (TX)	Dyson
Berman	Collins	Early
Bevill	Combest	Eckart (OH)
Billakis	Conte	Edgar
Bliley	Cooper	Edwards (CA)
Boland	Coughlin	Edwards (OK)
Boner (TN)	Courter	Emerson
Bonior (MI)	Craig	English
Boulter	Daniel	Evans (IA)

Evans (IL)	Lowry (WA)	Saxton	Carney	Hefner	Pepper
Fascell	Lujan	Schaefer	Carper	Heftel	Petri
Fawell	Luken	Schroeder	Carr	Hubbard	Price
Fazio	Lundine	Schuette	Chandler	Hyde	Rinaldo
Feighan	Mack	Schulze	Coelho	Jacobs	Ritter
Fiedler	MacKay	Schumer	Conyers	Jeffords	Rodino
Flippo	Madigan	Sensenbrenner	Coyne	Jenkins	Roe
Florio	Manton	Sharp	Crane	Johnson	Rostenkowski
Foglietta	Markey	Shaw	Crockett	Jones (OK)	Russo
Foley	Marlenee	Shumway	Dannemeyer	Kennelly	Savage
Ford (MI)	Martin (IL)	Shuster	Dellums	Lantos	Scheuer
Ford (TN)	Martinez	Sikorski	Derrick	Leath (TX)	Schneider
Fowler	Matsui	Sisisky	Donnelly	Lehman (CA)	Seiberling
Frank	Mavroules	Skeen	Durbin	Lent	Shelby
Frenzel	Mazzoli	Skeltan	Dymally	Lipinski	Siljander
Frost	McCain	Slattery	Eckert (NY)	Loeffler	Smith (NE)
Gallo	McCandless	Slaughter	Erdreich	Lott	St Germain
Gaydos	McCurdy	Smith (FL)	Fields	Lungren	Stokes
Gejdenson	McDade	Smith (IA)	Fish	Martin (NY)	Studds
Gekas	McEwen	Smith (NH)	Franklin	McCollum	Taylor
Gibbons	McGrath	Smith (NJ)	Fuqua	McHugh	Traxler
Gilman	McKernan	Smith, Denny	Garcia	McKinney	Udall
Gingrich	McMillan	Smith, Robert	Gephardt	Mikulski	Volkmer
Glickman	Meyers	Snowe	Goodling	Mitchell	Waxman
Gonzalez	Mica	Snyder	Gordon	Montgomery	Weaver
Gradison	Michel	Solarz	Gray (PA)	Murphy	Wilson
Gray (IL)	Miller (OH)	Solomon	Gregg	Nelson	Wylie
Green	Miller (WA)	Spence	Grothberg	Ortiz	Young (FL)
Guarini	Mineta	Spratt	Hansen	Oxley	
Gunderson	Moakley	Staggers	Hawkins	Packard	
Hall (OH)	Molinari	Stallings			
Hall, Ralph	Mollohan	Stangeland			
Hall, Sam	Monson	Stark			
Hamilton	Moody	Stenholm			
Hammerschmidt	Moore	Strang			
Hartnett	Moorhead	Stratton			
Hatcher	Morrison (CT)	Stump			
Hayes	Morrison (WA)	Sundquist			
Hendon	Mrazek	Sweeney			
Henry	Murtha	Swift			
Hertel	Myers	Swindall			
Hiler	Natcher	Synar			
Hillis	Neal	Tallon			
Holt	Nichols	Tauke			
Hopkins	Nielson	Tauzin			
Horton	Nowak	Thomas (CA)			
Howard	O'Brien	Thomas (GA)			
Hoyer	Oakar	Torres			
Huckaby	Oberstar	Torricelli			
Hughes	Obey	Towns			
Hunter	Olin	Trafiacant			
Hutto	Owens	Valentine			
Ireland	Panetta	Vander Jagt			
Jones (NC)	Parris	Vento			
Jones (TN)	Pashayan	Visclosky			
Kanjorski	Pease	Vucanovich			
Kaptur	Penny	Walgren			
Kasich	Perkins	Walker			
Kastenmeier	Pickle	Watkins			
Kemp	Porter	Weber			
Kildee	Pursell	Weiss			
Klaczka	Quillen	Wheat			
Kolbe	Rahall	Whitehurst			
Kolter	Rangel	Whitley			
Kostmayer	Ray	Whittaker			
Kramer	Regula	Whitten			
LaFalce	Reid	Williams			
Lagomarsino	Richardson	Wirth			
Latta	Ridge	Wise			
Leach (IA)	Roberts	Wolf			
Lehman (FL)	Robinson	Wolpe			
Leland	Roemer	Wortley			
Levin (MI)	Rogers	Wright			
Levine (CA)	Rose	Wyden			
Lewis (CA)	Roth	Yates			
Lewis (FL)	Roukema	Yatron			
Lightfoot	Rowland (CT)	Young (AK)			
Livingston	Rowland (GA)	Young (MO)			
Lloyd	Roybal	Zschau			
Long	Rudd				
Lowery (CA)	Sabo				

NAYS—1

Kindness

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Miller (CA)

NOT VOTING—106

Archer	Biaggi	Boucher
Badham	Boehlert	Boxer
Barnes	Boggs	Breaux
Barton	Bonker	Brooks
Beilenson	Borski	Burton (CA)
Bentley	Bosco	Bustamante

parliamentary democracy. All of us in this Chamber applaud the achievements the Federal Republic has made since World War II. The proudest of these has been the firm establishment of the rule of law based on respect for the dignity and worth of the individual.

But at the same time many in Congress and many more across our country and around the world are deeply concerned that during the President's visit to the Federal Republic, the reconciliation between our two countries is to be carried out in a ceremony which would leave the impression, correct or incorrect, that the United States is honoring those responsible for the darkest moment in human history and for the deaths in combat of our own soldiers and the murder of American prisoners of war. Surely we can find a more appropriate and acceptable way to mark the reconciliation of our two countries.

Mr. Speaker, I wish it were not necessary for the House to express itself on this issue but the President has been deaf to the chorus of calls from around the Nation for him to reconsider his visit to the Bitburg Cemetery. I hope that Chancellor Kohl and the German people understand our concerns and will respect the wishes of the Congress that the President change his itinerary.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] for the leadership they have shown regarding the subject of this resolution. They are each sponsors of their own resolution and I appreciate having their support for the legislation we are now considering. I also want to express my gratitude to the minority leader, Mr. MICHEL, the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, Mr. GILMAN, for their contribution to this initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise not only in support of the resolution, but also I would go even a step further and urge the President to call off his visit to the Bitburg Cemetery. Surely, there are other more appropriate cemeteries, monuments, or localities that could serve as an appropriate symbol of the end to intolerance, ruthless exploitation and brutality, and disregard for the dignity of the individual human being so characteristic of the Nazi era.

□ 1430

Mr. GUNDERSON and Mr. MOAKLEY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So a second was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 130.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is simple and straightforward. It is to express the sense of Congress that the President should not go to the Bitburg Cemetery during his scheduled trip to the Federal Republic of Germany.

The resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that:

It is U.S. policy to honor the millions of innocent civilians and hundreds of thousands of American and allied soldiers who suffered and died at the hands of the Nazis;

On the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II it is fitting that the President visit the Federal Republic, a nation with which we are now allied;

The President should pay tribute to relations between our countries through symbols of the Federal Republic's current democracy; and

The President should cancel his scheduled visit to the Bitburg cemetery.

I respect the President and Chancellor Kohl and their desire to demonstrate the fact that the United States and Germany are now friends and allies and that we share a common commitment to human rights and to

This President is very keenly aware of the significance of symbols and symbolism. He understood very well the importance to the Chinese people of his visit to the Great Wall, a symbol of China's greatness and endurance as a civilization throughout millenia. He understood very well the symbolism of his visit to Normandy Beach as one of the greatest monuments to Western civilization's determination to maintain freedom, even at great human cost. So also should he understand the symbolism—no, let me say the biting, bitter irony of his proposed visit to a cemetery which includes the remains of SS soldiers, the perpetrators of genocide and whose hated image motivated so many young Americans to make that ultimate sacrifice of their own lives.

A recent letter to the editor, published in the Washington Post best sums up the cruelty of the Nazi era and the disservice our President does, both to the history of the millions of Jews who lost their lives at the hands of the Nazis and the SS troopers, and to the memory of those allied forces who died trying to liberate western Europe from the Nazi yoke.

Jan Karski lived through that era; saw the brutal extermination of Jewish lives; he was a sensitive, caring, eyewitness to the atrocities, but also one who tried to bring to the allied governments the message of what was happening to Jews with a plea for help. It tortured his soul then that the help did not come and 40 years later it still pains this noble and peace-loving man, for whom I have such profound admiration.

I know Jan Karski personally and well—he was my graduate school professor at Georgetown University. He reminds us that we cannot succeed in our quest for peace, for integrity of nations or individuals unless we remember past cruelties so as not to relive them. In his own gentle way, Jan Karski reminds us powerfully that the Presidential visit to Bitburg in some sense exonerates what the SS and the Nazis did to Jews and to humanity and in another sense it diminishes the gallant fight for peace carried by our Allied forces.

Jan Karski has a brilliant command of history, coupled with a personal understanding of its lessons. I hope our generation will be as sensitive to those lessons as he. I hope this President will heed his voice of wisdom and cancel Bitburg.

I submit Dr. Karski's letter for my colleagues' review:

In November 1942—on my fourth secret trip between the Polish Anti-Nazi Underground and the Polish government-in-exile—I brought information on the fate of the Jews in Nazi-dominated Poland as well as desperate requests for help from Jews, addressed to the Allied governments, to save those who still could be saved. I saw the

Jewish ghetto in Warsaw. I saw the Belzec death camp. I was an eyewitness.

In London, I reported to the Polish government-in-exile as well as to four members of the British War Cabinet, Foreign Secretary Eden included. In the United States, I personally reported to the highest government and Catholic Church officials, including President Roosevelt, Apostolic Delegate Cardinal Cicognani, Rabbis Wise and Goldmann, and Justice Frankfurter.

The Jewish requests for help came to naught—the inactivity of the powerful Allied governments having been determined by war priorities, self-controlled ignorance, self-imposed disbelief or soulless rationality. Thus, 6 million Jews, helpless and abandoned by humanity, perished in agony.

Today, some 40 years later, as an old man coming to the end of his earthly journey, I cannot but raise my voice. We must pursue peace, cooperation, justice and freedom. But our pursuit cannot be based on self-imposed forgetfulness of what happened to the Jews during World War II.

JAN KARSKI.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I support this resolution. I intend to vote for it because I agree with the first three paragraphs, but I do not agree with paragraph 4, which would tie the President's hands and make the decision of where he should go while he is in Europe.

I think that someday we are going to have to recognize that this generation of West Germans who are living are not responsible nor should they be hung with the guilt of Adolf Hitler and the SS and all the other horrible people that involved themselves with Hitler in World War II. We should recognize that now.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and I commend our chairman and the ranking member for bringing it forward.

Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 130, expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the President's visit to the Federal Republic of Germany.

As we prepare to mark the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II, I commend President Reagan for his sincere and noble effort to focus his visit as a symbol of reconciliation with our German ally. However, I share the belief that the President's itinerary should be revised to exclude the proposed visit to the Bitburg Cemetery, and I so indicated to the President in a

personal letter I wrote earlier this month.

The President's sincerity of intentions are above reproach. Nevertheless, he is misguided in this matter. It is as Elie Wiesel has said, "That place, Mr. President, is not your place."

Surely, the heads of state of these two great democracies can reach accommodation so that American and German soldiers can be dignified in a solemn ceremony away from a site that symbolizes such human tragedy and bitterness. Mr. President, we must restore both dignity and peace of mind for Americans and Germans alike.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], who is the ranking member of the European Subcommittee.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL]. This controversial issue has, unfortunately, grown worse rather than better as discussion has accelerated. The chairman's resolution, of which I am pleased to be a cosponsor, goes to the heart of the matter, expressing the sense of Congress that the President should reconsider his visit to Bitburg Cemetery in light of recent disclosures that members of the infamous Nazi SS are buried there. I have personally expressed my serious concern on several occasions, and via several avenues, in opposition to the President's proposed visit to the Bitburg Cemetery.

We were privileged just a few days ago to hear the words of Elie Wiesel during the national civic commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the concentration camps held in the Capitol's rotunda. He very eloquently stated our innermost thoughts. We have tried to convey to the President our opposition to this particular aspect of the President's trip by way of cosponsorship of resolutions similar to the one before us today and through letters and by personal appeals.

Our constituents have expressed their considerable anguish and dismay about the President's proposed visit to the Bitburg Cemetery and the opposition has come from many different segments of our population.

Mr. Speaker, not only are the survivors of the death camps horrified at the precedent-setting implications of a visit of this type, but many veterans and Jewish groups as well are proclaiming their deep and heartfelt concern. The SS were not victims, Mr. Speaker, they were the personification of evil. They were the most hated and feared of all the Nazis, because entry

into this corps was voluntary and most stringent. Each member had to submit the details of his family tree in order to prove that there was no Jewish blood in the family. And not just for a few years, but going back to the 1750's. It is apparent that anyone willing to go to those lengths to join that group did not hate just one people, they hated all people. They fought against our American soldiers who had committed themselves to the noblest principles of our Nation, among them freedom of word, deed and religion. Many of us in this body believe that our President should not represent the American people at a place which harbors the remains of SS soldiers when the remains of 6 million Jews are scattered ashes across Europe. As Elie Wiesel poignantly said of Bitburg, "Mr. President, this place is not your place."

Along with many others, I have suggested that a more appropriate site for the President to visit in Germany would be the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Indeed, press accounts this morning indicate that this option is supported by certain German leaders. For example, Franz Josef Strauss is reported as saying that "instead of going to Bitburg, Mr. Reagan could lay a wreath at the unknown soldier's monument in Munich."

Others have suggested a cemetery in Luxembourg where both American servicemen and German armed forces soldiers are buried. There are a number of options available to the President to pay homage to all the dead who fought with honor, but a visit to the Bitburg Cemetery should not be one of them. Mr. President, I join my concerned colleagues in urging you to revise your European agenda, omitting any visit to the Bitburg Cemetery.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass House Concurrent Resolution 130.

□ 1440

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this resolution, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Florida, Chairman FASCELL, in endorsing the resolution before us.

This resolution expresses the sense of the Congress on this important matter, while respecting the constitutional prerogatives of the President of the United States.

While it is fitting that our Government honor the memories of the millions of innocent civilians and Allied soldiers who died in that great conflict, the President should reconsider his visit to the Bitburg Cemetery.

As my colleagues well know, countless American and Allied soldiers lost their lives at the hands of the Nazis. In a gesture of reconciliation, it is appropriate that President Reagan visit West Germany to pay honor to the

fallen who gave their lives in the struggle against mindless nazism.

The Federal Republic of Germany has made great strides in many areas since that terrible war. That democratic country is now a respected friend of the United States, and relations between our two great nations are flourishing.

To highlight the major strides that Germany has made in building an open democratic society, the President should recognize progress in that area by visiting an appropriate symbol of modern democratic Germany, rather than visiting the cemetery, which is replete with so many memories of the tragic past.

With these thoughts in mind, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution urging the President not to visit Bitburg, probably the worst blunder of his Presidency. If the President goes, it will leave a permanent blot on history, on the United States of America.

I beseech the President, please, do not go to Bitburg in the name of Holocaust survivors, an extremely large concentration of which reside in the 10th District. These are people—we have all seen the pictures—who came to the United States with nothing. They love this country. This country has made them everything that they are. They are fervent patriots. And now the President is going to honor the very organization that brought them and their families death and destruction.

The idea of visiting a concentration camp, Bergen-Belsen, as an ameliorative gesture, is repugnant to them.

This is not an issue of equal time where the President first goes to a concentration camp and goes to honor the SS, giving each side its due. Has the moral relativism of our age so engulfed everything that there is no sense of proportion and no sense of values?

I speak from the point of view of American veterans who fought valiantly against Nazis.

It was the Waffen SS, that shot American POW's in cold blood and then stood their bodies up and used them as target practice.

Mr. President, is it appropriate to honor this organization? The specific unit of Waffen SS that is buried in this cemetery took 659 French men, women, and children at Oradour locked them in a barn and burnt the barn. When a few, including a young child, tried to escape, the Waffen SS of this unit brutally machinegunned them down. It was this unit of the SS, not another.

I speak from the point of view of diplomacy, Mr. President. It is ironic that the decision to visit Bitburg is not bringing postwar Germany and America closer together. It is pushing America and postwar Germany further apart.

Finally, Mr. President, and most importantly, I speak in the name of moral leadership. We love this country because the United States has stood as a beacon of moral leadership. This President is the President of the free world, of the greatest country in the world, of a country that prides itself on being above others in terms of what it must do, what it can do, and what it will do.

By honoring the graves of SS soldiers, Mr. President, what you are doing is dimming that beacon of moral leadership. You are leaving a permanent blot on this country's history, a blot no matter what you say, no matter what you do at the cemetery or afterward, that cannot be undone.

Mr. President, this resolution is a last plea. Do not visit Bitburg. Please, in the name of the United States, in the name of diplomacy, in the name of reconciliation and morality, do not visit Bitburg.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, the President's plans for his upcoming trip to West Germany and the comments he has made has caused me grave concern.

As one of the five Members of this House on the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, I know that the President has shown the utmost sympathies for the victims of the Holocaust and their families, as well as for the American and allied troops who died in World War II; but as the Chairman of the Council, Elie Wiesel, has said, Bitburg is not the place of the President. His place is with the survivors.

If the President's desire was to put the war behind us and improve personal and official ties to the West German Government, the visit to Bitburg Cemetery has now made that impossible. One can and one must separate Nazi war criminals from the present West German leaders and citizenry, but the SS are surely among the war criminals; nor can one equate even the non-SS soldiers, even conscripts, to civilian victims of the Nazi war machine and the Holocaust.

Germany has been a reliable NATO ally during the last four decades; however, that in no way changes history.

If the President wants to commemorate 40 years of friendship with the present-day Government of West Germany, I suggest that there are other more appropriate ways to show this.

I urge the President not to go to Bitburg and I urge the House to approve this resolution.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise with no anger, only the best interests of our President and our country.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is needed. A mistake has been made. There has been a serious error in judgment. What we have always admired about this President is that when he felt strongly and when he felt he was right, he let us know.

Well, now what we seek to admire in this President is that when he has made a mistake, when he has committed a wrong, that he admit it. This visit to Bitburg is a mistake of many dimensions.

We do not contend that this President and this Congress should not find a symbol of reconciliation, a place of friendship to visit, to build on a new relationship with Germany. We should, but Germany abounds with such symbols; the grave site of Adenauer; Dresden, the destroyed cities of the Rhine, places where America and Germany together can see the destruction, the hate of the Nazis.

Bitburg is not such a symbol. It is not a symbol for several reasons. The first occurred on December 18, 1944, when the soldiers buried at Bitburg, these innocent conscripts which the President would cite, led 86 American soldiers to a field, machinegunned them for 15 minutes and then walked to each and emptied their pistols.

It is not a symbol because the SS, not innocent conscripts which the President would cite, soldiers who according to the Nuremberg investigation belonged to a criminal association.

Third, it is not a symbol because this above all else is an opportunity for the Soviet Union. The pictures of this President at Bitburg will be shown on all corners of this Earth, distorted and misused for the purposes of the Soviet Union.

We know those who favor this visit. Some have spoken of it. Secretary Kissinger, President Nixon, they have found advantages in it, and we are not surprised. We know their morality. We know their purposes. They are not ours.

We ask this President not to make it his, either. President Reagan has stood for great good for our country and accomplished great good in the world; but this is a great wrong.

Mr. President, admit it, change it. Do not offend the good name of our country. There is no place for you at the tomb of the unknown Nazi. Find a better site to visit, Mr. President.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. FIEDLER].

□ 1450

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. Listening to the debate which was taking place just a few moments ago by my colleague from Brooklyn, NY, I was reminded of a recent incident in history, an incident very similar to the one that he described, where Jews were herded into a synagogue and it was set afire. This incident took place in Nicaragua, where the Jewish community, while at prayer, had the synagogue torched.

I raise this issue as we discuss this important historic fact to make certain that we remember that those elements that were responsible for what took place in Germany in the 1940's continue to exist today. It is our responsibility as citizens and as Members of Congress to be ever watchful and to make certain that not only does the Holocaust never happen again, but that we in no way contribute to support of a government that could be supporting continued anti-Semitism.

I might add one further note. Today in Nicaragua there is no Jewish community as a result of continuing discrimination which takes place there.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FOWLER].

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, as a U.S. veteran, I join with other veterans in opposing the President's trip. As we approach the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II, it is altogether fitting that we remember the terrible events of those days, mourn those killed during the war, and rejoice in the victory over Fascism. It is also appropriate that we celebrate the accomplishments of our friend and ally, the Federal Republic of Germany, which arose from the ashes of defeat to become a democratic and valued member of the community of nations.

But it is neither fitting nor appropriate for the President of the United States to honor the SS graves at Bitburg. As a veteran, I am outraged that an American President should pay his respects at the graves of Nazi storm troopers who executed American POW's during the war.

As a human being, I am appalled that our Chief Executive is participating in ceremonies commemorating the graves of those who implemented the Holocaust, one of the darkest events in the history of humanity.

I join with my Democratic and Republican colleagues in support of House Concurrent Resolution 130 which urges President Reagan to reconsider his trip to the Bitburg military cemetery during his upcoming

trip to West Germany. There are far better ways to serve the memories of the victims of World War II.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. I rise in strong support of the resolution. I might add the point that what Mr. Kissinger and Mr. Nixon practiced was realpolitik. What is necessary here is a clear, simple statement on morality.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN].

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for offering this resolution and for his leadership on this important issue.

If I could send just one simple message to the President regarding his planned visit to the Bitburg Military Cemetery it would be this: It's not too late to do the right thing and cancel this trip.

West German Chancellor Kohl has described the President's planned visit to Bitburg as the "noble gesture of a friend." With all due respect to the Chancellor, I fail to see anything whatsoever that is noble about opening old wounds.

Likewise, a number of people have suggested that it would be a sign of weakness for the President to change his plans at this point. I couldn't disagree more. To change one's mind in the face of new evidence is, in my opinion, the mark of a strong man. Mr. Reagan has demonstrated such strength in the past.

There are three major reasons why I believe it is inappropriate for the President to go to Bitburg:

No. 1, the military cemetery at Bitburg is not just any cemetery. It is a cemetery where more than 40 members of the Nazi elite—the SS—are buried; and in a position of honor. According to an eyewitness who visited the cemetery at the request of the highly respected Simon Wiesenthal Center, the SS members are buried in a semi-circle around the memorial which the President plans to visit. In other words, if the President lays a wreath at the memorial, he will in essence be laying a wreath at the feet of the SS!

No. 2, the SS members buried at Bitburg are not just young recruits drafted against their will as some of the administration's remarks have suggested. According to an analysis of information supplied by the Wiesenthal Center, at least 14 of them were between the ages of 23 and 44 when they died. One of these individuals, SS Staff Sgt. Franz Otto Bengel, was awarded Germany's second highest medal, the German Cross in gold, for

killing 10 American soldiers, according to the Wiesenthal Center. (In response to a request for information from Jack Anderson, the German Embassy has confirmed that Bengel received this award.) No one knows how many total deaths—of Americans, European Jews, and other persons—for which the SS members buried there were responsible.

No. 3, and perhaps most important, there simply is no reason for the President to go to Bitburg. If he really wants to honor Germans involved in World War II, there are plenty of places he could go where he could achieve that task in a manner consistent with this Nation's role in the war and our longstanding commitment to freedom of religion, speech, and thought. A good example is Plötzensee prison outside of Berlin where non-Jewish German nationals who resisted Nazism were hung on meathooks by the Nazis.

The President's plans to go to Bitburg already have brought pain to millions of Americans.

I am thinking particularly of the thousands of World War II veterans who fought valiantly on the battlefields of Germany and Eastern Europe to end Nazi terrorism and preserve freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of thought—and the families of the thousands more who gave their lives in this noble endeavor.

Mr. President, don't prolong the pain of these brave Americans any longer. Change your mind now and don't visit the Bitburg Cemetery.

Mr. AuCOIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDEN. I yield to my colleague from Oregon [Mr. AuCOIN].

Mr. AuCOIN. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Obviously this originally was an effort to put behind the two countries, in the name of reconciliation, a great wrong. But I would suggest to my colleagues, and particularly to this President, there are some things that should not be put behind us. There are some things that should be remembered. An unspeakable atrocity committed by some who lay in the graves that the President would now visit are wrongs that should always be remembered by humankind, lest they be repeated.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I hope very much this President, the leader of our country, does not honor these German dead.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDEN. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing that we need to fear is amnesia.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the entire Bitburg episode has raised serious questions about the role of the United States and its moral leadership in the world.

Traditionally, the United States has conducted its foreign policy from a different set of values than those of the rest of the world. We have always considered ourselves to be different, to have the ability to look at the world from a position of higher moral leadership than other nations. Every President has called on our Nation and our people to exert this higher level of moral leadership that is expressed through our values, our national character, and our institutions such as the U.S. Constitution, the Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence.

Our ability to point to our moral leadership, however, has been seriously threatened by the President's decision to go to the cemetery at Bitburg. The decision to pay tribute to the internationally-recognized symbol of genocide goes beyond mere insensitivity or bad judgment. To anyone with a sense of history, this decision is a mistake. After decades of exerting moral leadership in world affairs, the symbol that is the United States—fairness, democracy, self-determination, and respect for the rights and liberties of all peoples, weak and strong alike—is suddenly, jarringly linked with everything that we stand against.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with our Nation's veterans and people everywhere who say "Never again" in opposing the President's decision to go to Bitburg. It is wrong, it threatens our ability to conduct a foreign policy based on moral leadership, and it should be canceled before further damage is incurred.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong support of this resolution, saying a week ago this last Monday that the White House ought to hire my mother to remind the President of the four most difficult words for a politician to say: "I made a mistake."

Don't go, Mr. President.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. I joined in a letter to Chancellor Kohl asking him to be graceful enough to take the President off the hook. The response we got was a rather snarly response from the legislative body over there.

I think that illustrates how this whole matter is going to permanently damage, at least for this generation, the relationship between our countries. Chancellor Kohl has shown no signs of acceding to Congress' request that he intervene in this matter and extend an invitation to President Reagan to visit some other appropriate site to pay respect to the German people. As a matter of fact, the West German Government recently affirmed its intention not to release President Reagan from his commitment to visit the Bitburg Cemetery.

The decision to visit Bitburg Cemetery has become the most embarrassing incident of President Reagan's 4½ years in office. It has awakened deep and bitter emotions among thousands of Holocaust survivors, and has elicited a wave of criticism from our Nation's largest veterans and Jewish groups. It has also brought pain to the thousands of World War II veterans who left their youth on the battlefields of Germany and Eastern Europe in the fight to end Nazi terrorism and preserve freedom of speech and freedom of thought.

Bitburg is not just any military cemetery. It is a cemetery where members of the SS and other Nazi officials who played a role in the deaths of American soldiers are buried. SS units provided the guards for concentration camps, participated directly in the murder of millions of persons during World War II, and were involved in the execution of American prisoners of war during the Battle of the Bulge. These SS members should not be the recipients of any tribute by the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I served in the U.S. Navy when the Battle of the Bulge occurred. I was safe—in Oklahoma. I watched avidly, shocked by the blatant atrocities committed by the Nazis. How could you forget the Battle of the Bulge and the American soldiers who lost their lives because of such acts perpetrated by Nazi officials.

Given the outrageous acts committed by the Nazi in World War II and the inappropriateness of the President of the United States memorializing the participants in these acts, the President should cancel his visit to the military cemetery in Bitburg. It is my hope that the President will reconsider this unfortunate decision and visit some other appropriate site to pay respect to the German people. Such action would certainly foster peace and understanding between our two nations, and resolve a controversy that threatens to have long and serious repercussions in the United States. ●

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I think it is entirely appropriate on the occasion

of the 40th anniversary of the end of the Second World War for President Reagan, in a gesture of reconciliation, to visit the Federal Republic of Germany. Germany was once our enemy. It is now our friend, and it is an important part of the Western Alliance.

But I also believe it is entirely inappropriate for the President, during the course of his visit to the Federal Republic, to implicitly pay tribute to men who lie buried at Bitburg who fought in the service of a truly evil empire, and who were responsible for some of the most monstrous crimes in the history of the human race.

Let the President, during the course of his visit to the Federal Republic, pay tribute to the good Germany rather than the bad Germany. Let him lay a wreath, for example, on the tomb of Pastor Martin Niemöller who was executed by the Nazis because of his opposition to Hitler, as a way of demonstrating that we reject the doctrine of collective responsibility and that we recognize that not all Germans supported the Nazi regime.

Let him pay tribute to the new Germany rather than the old Germany by laying a wreath on the tomb of Konrad Adenauer, that great German statesman who did so much to help establish on a firm foundation the principles of political decency and democracy of the new Germany.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to say that this is not a Jewish issue. It is an American issue. All Americans, black Americans, Hispanic Americans, Italo-Americans, Polish Americans, veterans' groups, and millions and millions of people throughout our country who understand that World War II was not the traditional conflict between nation states but a primordial struggle against the forces of unmitigated evil, believe that it would be terribly wrong for the President of the United States to go to the cemetery at Bitburg, and there to implicitly pay homage to men who were responsible not only for the murder of 6 million Jews but for the murder of American POW's and countless others.

And so, Mr. Speaker, at this last moment, shortly before the President is about to embark on his trip to Europe, this resolution expresses the hope of what I am sure will be the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House that he reconsider his plans and not proceed with his projected visit to the cemetery at Bitburg.

Mr. SHARP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLARZ. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP].

Mr. SHARP. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it is an act of strength to correct this tragic mistake, and it is an act of wisdom to heed the moral call of Elie Wiesel.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARTNETT].

Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat reluctant to come here today, but I feel it somewhat my duty to come here today.

This is one Congressman who is not willing to condemn President Reagan for his planned trip to Bitburg. A mistake, Mr. Speaker? Yes. A blunder? Yes. Poor judgment? Yes.

I have joined with my colleagues, many of whom have offered a letter to the German Chancellor asking that he revoke the invitation to President Reagan to visit the cemetery at Bitburg.

□ 1500

But, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I would say to you that you do your country a great injustice when you try to imply that it is to honor SS troops that President Reagan visits Bitburg Cemetery. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, those horrible men who lie in Bitburg Cemetery have already faced a judgment far more critical and far more important than Members of this House of Representatives can pass on them. History and the world, indeed these United States, know the feeling of this Congress. They know the feeling of this President that none of us support what was done by those SS troops. None of us think it wise for President Reagan to visit Bitburg Cemetery if it is to be construed as some visit to honor those horrible men and their dastardly deeds. But the patriotism of President Reagan cannot be questioned. He is a man who hates evil but loves his country very much and sees his duty.

He is a man unlike most Members in this Congress willing to stand up and do what has to be done, the controversy notwithstanding.

Mr. President, I think you know and I think we know that you know it is probably a very poor public relations move, but I know, Mr. President, that no one in this world, be he Jew or Gentile, German or American, holds more hatred in their heart than you for what was done to a race of people in Germany 40 years ago.

You wore your country's uniform, Mr. President, in defense of this country and in opposition to that type of evil.

Mr. President, you are going to have a lot of flak in the months and weeks ahead. But I am confident, Mr. President, that you will weather this storm as you have weathered others. I do not think that you should make a visit to one place to offset another. The evil is a given that was done by those who are nameless and faceless but who are buried in that cemetery.

But the judgment that we pass on to them, my friends, will be pale and has been pale to the judgment that they

have already faced, if you believe as most Jews and Christians do that there is a hereafter and that you will one day face a judgment.

We are not going to honor SS troops but the state of the German people. Evil existed in this world 40 years ago.

Where were you when we gave Germany the Marshall plan? I hear no one criticizing Marshall.

What the President is doing is diplomatic; what the President is doing has a lot more to do with foreign relations than any of you will ever be able to do. And I ask you, there is one prayer, my friends, uttered by Jews, Christians, Germans, and Americans alike. It goes something like, "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us."

And let me say one more thing to you in closing: President Reagan, thank God, is one of the few men whom we know is a patriot. And I think you do him a great disservice when you try to make him to be some evil man because of the invitation of a head of state he is going to visit the final resting place of men who either did their duty willingly or were forced to do their duty; I cannot pass judgment onto them, nor will I.

But I say to you, Mr. President, you go to Germany, you meet the German Chancellor and the German people and you hold you head high, Mr. President, because there is no one in this country who would in any way whatsoever try to make you or anyone believe that we think you supported the type of activity that went on in Germany some 40 years ago. So you go to Germany, Mr. President, as the leader of the kindest, the greatest, and most benevolent country in the world, all of her people who love good and hate evil.

I can tell you this, Mr. President, I might stand alone in this well but I will not politicize the evil acts of horrible men and women of 40 years ago. I will stand here, Mr. President, in support of your visit and I wish you Godspeed.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE].

Mr. WOLPE. It is extraordinary, Mr. Speaker, that we should have had to offer this resolution today. Why is it so difficult for the President of the United States to understand as Elie Wiesel has said that his place is not at Bitburg at the graves of storm troopers but with the survivors? We understand that the President is a proud man and that he does not wish to back off of his commitment that he has extended to Chancellor Kohl. But he must be made to understand somehow, and I hope this resolution will help, to understand the enormous hurt and the enormous pain he causes to all of the Holocaust survivors, to all Ameri-

can veterans, and to Americans throughout our country.

Surely, there must be a better means of preserving a valued relationship with an ally than to undertake a symbolic act that will be understood as an attempt to erase the horrors that were perpetrated at the hands of the SS.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, no one is saying that the President of the United States is evil. I rise in support of this resolution because we want the President to represent the best interests of the people in this country who are sensitive to the atrocities that have been committed in the past. Many of our Jewish friends throughout the world have said, "We shall never forget," and I think when you walk through the halls of Dachau as I did with the Speaker in the concentration camp or Yad Vashem in Jerusalem that you cannot help but wonder how people could possibly have treated each other in this way, and we would like to believe it could not happen again.

My colleagues, when you see what is going on today in South Africa, you wonder is there not a parallel in what is going on between the way the Nazis treated the Jews in Germany and the way the white minority are treating the blacks in Africa.

Did they not use the same racist policies and does not the President of the United States still believe that a constructive engagement in South Africa can stop the atrocities that are being committed against the blacks?

It seems to me that when people say that "We shall never forget" that we can understand today that it is a very thin threshold in what man can do against his fellow man.

It seems to me that we should be reminded that we should not pay tribute to those who committed those acts no matter how badly we want to make certain we are friends of the Germans, nor should we be friends to those people committing similar acts to those people in South Africa.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think that most of the points with regard to the morality of the symbolism have been made and have been made very, very well and very eloquently.

One thing that I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, is in response to a prior speaker who spoke against this resolution. He argued that our President is making this trip with regard to issues pertaining to diplomacy and with regard to issues pertaining to foreign relations, and it is on that basis

that I think that we should also look at the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, no action that this President has taken during the 4½ years of his Presidency has been more misguided on those two criteria, the criterion of diplomacy, and the criterion of foreign relations.

Our Soviet adversaries have been looking for an opportunity to embarrass the United States in Eastern and in Western Europe on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of V-E Day. We could not have given them a better opportunity than the symbolism of this trip.

We have tried with great success since World War II to be responsible leaders of the Western Alliance. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this visit will do more to divide us from our allies than anything that we have done during that time period.

□ 1510

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. I would like to associate my remarks with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARTNETT]. I think our President is on a mission of trying to heal the hurts that have happened in this world of ours, and I think that we make a mistake doing this resolution.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let me just say briefly in response to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARTNETT] and those who agree with him, the ultimate test of our feelings is our actions, and the ultimate test of our actions is their morality.

If we cannot pass judgment on the actions of Nazi Germany, we can pass judgment on nothing.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

The idea of reconciliation is a good one, but there are some things with which we cannot be reconciled. We cannot be reconciled with Nazism and we cannot be reconciled with a holocaust.

We have reconciled with the Germans; we helped rebuild their country. That is the strongest symbol of what we have done; that is debased, that is affronted by what the President proposes to do.

Mr. President, please do not go to Bitburg. It is an insult to the veterans who died for this country. It is an insult to the Holocaust victims. It is an insult to all Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida. [Mr. FASCELL]

has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. President, close your eyes. Let your mind turn inward to your soul. What do you see, Mr. President? The Second World War, the tragedy that befell all humankind. The tragedy that befell concentration camp victims and survivors, families and people in many countries in all of Europe, and in America, even in the Soviet Union.

Close your eyes and let your mind go to your soul. Whose name do you honor? Whose memory do you honor by going to Bitburg? Those that perpetrated the very crimes that your soul reels from in recalling them.

These are not the people to do honor to. You have been described here as a patriot. What is a patriot? A patriot is a true lover of his country. If you truly love your country, Mr. President, then we believe, all of us, that you do.

You will honor the memory of those Americans who fought and died, of those concentration camp victims, and survivors, and families. You will honor the grief of Americans and people worldwide who suffered enormously, who suffered grievously at the hands of the people who are buried in that cemetery.

A true patriot, Mr. President, honors the memory of those in his country and those who fought for freedom and democracy. And as a true patriot, Mr. President, you do great disservice to those people whom you should honor by honoring those who visited on this century some of the most heinous crimes ever committed in recorded history.

Close your eyes, Mr. President. Turn your mind inward to your soul. If you do that, you will make the right decision, and you will not go to the Bitburg Cemetery, and then you will be doing justice not only to the Americans and to those that died in Europe, but also to those true Germans whose postwar Germany represents the true Germany.

● Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words in support of House Concurrent Resolution 130.

Although I am pleased that President Reagan will include a visit to a Nazi concentration camp site on the itinerary for his forthcoming visit to West Germany, I object to his planned visit to the Bitburg Cemetery.

While I appreciate and support the themes of reconciliation and mutual friendship which the President is attempting to stress during his visit, I believe that we should pay tribute to symbols of the Federal Republic's cur-

rent democracy rather than to symbols of its unfortunate past.

Considering that the majority of those Germans buried at Bitburg fought against American servicemen at the Battle of the Bulge, in which 77,000 Americans died; considering that it is likely that some of the soldiers buried at Bitburg participated in the massacre of American prisoners at Malmédy, Belgium; and considering that many of those buried at Bitburg were members of the Waffen SS, an elite Nazi unit which is an internationally recognized symbol of the crime of genocide perpetrated by the Nazis against the Jewish people and humanity; I find it totally inappropriate that a President of the United States should pay tribute to German soldiers buried at Bitburg Cemetery.

In light of the aforementioned considerations I was an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 125 introduced by Congressman TORRICELLI, and I am in strong support of this House Concurrent Resolution 130 calling upon President Reagan to reconsider the inclusion of the Bitburg Cemetery on the itinerary for his upcoming visit to West Germany.●

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 130, which asks the President to reconsider his planned visit to the German war cemetery of Bitburg where Nazi soldiers including some members of the SS unit are buried.

Apparently, the original intent for laying the wreath at Bitburg was to symbolize the spirit of reconciliation that President Reagan in his visit to West Germany wants to stress. But let us stop for a moment and ask, "What are we reconciling ourselves with?" Are we making peace with the legacy of Hitler's Nazi forces and the atrocities that they committed?

When Hitler came to power and began his aggression against the countries of Europe, he had in his mind supreme victory and a new order for the world. He envisaged an order in which those that he considered "racially superior" would rule and those that he considered "racially inferior" would perish. Hitler's new order wiped out religion, it wiped out free speech, free thought, almost every kind of freedom that we Americans know and enjoy. If the Allied forces had not won the war, Europe and many other nations of this world would have been enveloped in a nightmare under a racist militaristic political order that they might never have escaped. The concentration camps in which 6 million Jews and millions others died stands today as testimony to this evil.

Make peace with that kind of legacy, Mr. Speaker? I think not.

Let me make clear that we know that the sins of the last generation of Germans must not be held against the new generation of Germans. Those of

us that protest the visit to Bitburg are not accusing the present Germany of atrocities that were committed by Hitler. A Presidential visit to a concentration camp will not signify accusation, but simply acceptance of history as it really was.

But I am wary of what a Presidential visit to Bitburg would achieve or what it will come to symbolize. At the very least, it may symbolize making peace with the Nazi legacy, which would be unacceptable, and at the worst, it could symbolize some sort of absolution for Nazi war criminals, which would be unspeakable.

At the end of World War II, I believe we made a promise not only to those who died a brutal death in the concentration camps, but also to posterity, indeed, to humanity. Never again, we promised, never again will we let such a holocaust take place. We promised that we would never forget the atrocities of Hitler, lest the world repeat such horror again. If President Reagan goes to Bitburg, we will be on the road to breaking that promise. We would be signifying that we are willing to forget and forgive acts that cannot ever be forgotten or forgiven.

I understand the President's desire to move forward and celebrate with the democratic Government of West Germany the joint pursuit of peace, cooperation, justice, and freedom. Let us move forward, but let us not forget the tragedy, let us not concede the horror in our haste to move on. Let us not reject the memories of those innocent millions who were brutally put to death in concentration camps.

I do not think the German people have forgotten this. I do not think the Jewish people have forgotten. I do not think those who fought in World War II have forgotten. I certainly do not think the President of our country should act as if he has forgotten. I urge my colleagues to adopt House Concurrent Resolution 130 which expresses the sense of this Congress that the President should cancel his visit to Bitburg. I believe a more suitable way can be found to commemorate the end of World War II and the friendship between West Germany and our country.●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the subject of the apparent irreversible decision of President Reagan to visit a military cemetery at Bitburg, West Germany, on Sunday May 5. I am astounded over the fact that despite the tremendous outpouring of opposition from so many groups and individuals who would take personal offense from such a visit, that the White House is holding firm on their decision to have the President visit this cemetery.

On April 12 I sent the following telegram to the President, in which I urged him to cancel the visit. I said:

I understand that you are contemplating a visit to the Bitburg military cemetery in Germany as part of your upcoming European trip. I urge you to cancel this visit because it is both inappropriate and insensitive to the Jewish community of our nation and the world, and to American veterans of World War I and II.

When you chose not to visit the concentration camp at Dachau, as part of this same trip, you expressed concern that it might rekindle fears and anguish of this horrible era in world history. I contend that a visit to a cemetery where only German soldiers and civilians are buried presents a greater opportunity to reopen wounds in the Jewish community. It is impossible not to assume that among those in Bitburg cemetery would be German soldiers responsible for the murder of innocent Jewish men, women and children in the Nazi reign of terror. The very possibility of this should cause you to want to cancel this visit.

Further the absence of any U.S. military personnel in the Bitburg Cemetery lends further justification for canceling this visit. If we are to pay honor to the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II, our primary tribute should be paid to the brave American soldiers who gave up their lives in defense of freedom.

(I hope you will act swiftly to cancel this visit.)

As mentioned, this telegram was sent on April 12. Subsequent events have indicated that indeed there are Nazi soldiers buried at Bitburg. Specifically, of the 1,800 German soldiers buried in Bitburg, 47 are members of the Waffen SS, the combat contingent of the elite Nazi unit that ran the death camps and presided over the murders of 6 million Jews.

The question one must ask is why? Why would the President of the United States proceed on this visit when such a hue and cry has been heard from so many different segments of our population. While one can understand the importance of maintaining good relations with Germany and for heads of state to maintain good relations, one must make the exception in this instance. The simple fact is Chancellor Kohl should do the honorable thing and withdraw the invitation at once.

It is my fervent hope that some solution can be developed which will lead to the President not setting foot in the Bitburg Cemetery. It is the wrong thing to do at a time in history when we need not be reminded about the atrocities committed by the Nazis in Germany. If the President's purpose on this trip is to help bring about reconciliation then let us not permit an action to be taken that can only reignite the horrors of an era in time when man's inhumanity to man was at its worst.●

● Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is in support of the resolution asking the President to reconsider his visit to Bitburg Cemetery

during his trip to West Germany next month.

Since the purpose of the visit is to strengthen the bridges of mutual understanding and cooperation between a new generation of Germans and a new generation of Americans, the proposed visit to a cemetery to honor those who participated in the Nazi Holocaust has created a divisive issue, which if carried out, will do great harm to the goal and purpose of the overall exchange visit.

The magnitude of the controversy leaves no alternative measure but for the President to forthrightly declare that he will not participate in that function.●

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 130 and urge its adoption by the House of Representatives.

President Reagan's decision to visit the Bitburg Military Cemetery in West Germany has touched a raw nerve in our country. No one denies the validity of the President's desire to mark the end of World War II in Europe in a way that demonstrates the bond of friendship that has developed between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany over the last 40 years. That is a good and proper purpose, and bespeaks the need for an appropriate ceremony which reflects the history of post-World War II Europe, while not forgetting the sacrifices of millions of soldiers and civilians who perished in that war. But, Mr. Speaker, the Bitburg Cemetery visit is not that kind of ceremony.

The Nazi SS troopers buried in Bitburg were members of an organization that perpetrated some of the worst atrocities of the Nazi era. American soldiers were among the victims of those atrocities, as were millions of people, of all religious faiths, who perished in the Nazi camps. It is the memories of these individuals that a President of the United States should honor; he should not be in a position where it appears that he is paying tribute to the memories of their tormentors.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the passage of this resolution will encourage the President to reconsider his trip to the Bitburg Cemetery. In so doing he will be acting in a manner consistent with what I believe to be the overwhelming sentiment of the American people, who want to commemorate the end of World War II while not forgetting its lessons.●

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolutions offered by the gentleman from Florida regarding the President's visit to Germany.

As this amendment states, it is indeed fitting and appropriate that the President visit Germany on the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II as an acknowledgment of our

friendship and alliance with that nation today.

The 40 years which have passed since the end of the Second World War, however, have not dimmed the horrid memories of the atrocities committed by the Nazis in the Third Reich. These memories of a traumatized generation of Jews and of a shocked world will endure forever as a sign of, as Ellis Weisel stated, "the fragility of the human condition."

The worst of these crimes were perpetrated by the SS, and they have overwhelmed the spirit of reconciliation which the President sought to bring with him to the Bitburg Cemetery. I truly believe that the President was not aware of the SS men buried in that cemetery when he made his decision, now that he is aware, however, another decision must be made, this time to forgo the Bitburg Cemetery.

If the President is to do so, yet still pay respect to the German people, we should seek the assistance of Chancellor Helmut Kohl, and ask that he withdraw his invitation to Bitburg and instead extend an invitation for the President to visit an appropriate site. I believe such an approach can preserve this visit as a concrete symbol of unity and reconciliation between the United States and Germany, rather than a divisive and painful moment for both nations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this amendment, but, more importantly, I urge the President to reflect on his commitment to humanity and cancel the visit to Bitburg.●

● Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is important that all sides are heard on the resolution to compel the President not to visit the Bitburg Cemetery. No one has argued or can argue that the visit is anything less than an unfortunate mistake, but we must remember that the President must have control of our foreign policy. We in Congress can and must let him know our feelings of the actions he takes, but we must not fall into the trap of having this legislative body—the Congress—make foreign policy.

It is for this reason that I take opportunity to express to the President that it is my opinion that he should not visit the cemetery if he thinks it is at all possible to cancel that part of his trip. The Nazi SS represent how base and immoral man can be and it would be a mistake to honor them in any way, even if unintended. I want to make it clear that my vote on this resolution does not mean that I feel the President should go to Bitburg, but instead it expresses my view of the function of Congress. While I express my personal disapproval as a Member of Congress, I believe that the President must make our foreign policy taking into account the feelings and counsel of individual Members of Congress and the people they represent, under-

standing that it is his decision to make.●

● Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the resolution which calls on the President to reconsider the inclusion of the Bitburg Military Cemetery on his agenda of his upcoming trip to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Despite intense and emotional opposition to the Bitburg Cemetery visit, the President remains firm in his judgment to carry out this function. Many veterans groups, as well as Jewish organizations have expressed their strong disapproval to this visit. This cemetery contains not only the remains of Nazi soldiers who fought against U.S. servicemen, but also some 30 members of the infamous SS, who were primarily responsible for the annihilation of some 12 million Jews and other innocent civilians.

I am outraged that the President will make such a visit. The President chooses to salute a very dark part of World War II history when thousands and thousands of innocent men, women, and children were selectively murdered, simply because they were Jews. The visit to the Bitburg Cemetery is a terrible mistake and its a decision which contradicts what this Nation stands for and represents throughout our 200-year-old history.

Instead, I believe the President should focus on the common goals of the German and American people and the cooperative relationship we have developed in the last 40 years. He should recognize what we have achieved today and what we can accomplish by working together for democracy in the future.

It is truly unfortunate that the President will visit Bitburg. Today, I join with the rest of my colleagues in the Congress in making a final plea to the President to remove the Bitburg visit from his agenda.●

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 130, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the President's upcoming trip to West Germany. I, like many other Members of Congress, had hoped that better judgment would have prevailed and the matter of Bitburg could have been resolved without the division and embarrassment caused by congressional resolutions and letters. As events have progressed, however, it is increasingly clear that a reassessment of the Bitburg visit will not be forthcoming without congressional pressure.

From the outset, let me make clear that I, like all Americans, applaud the trip's goal of reconciliation. Post-war Germany is a valued and trusted friend of the Western alliance, and the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II is an especially appropriate time to mark the deep friendship and

mutual respect that has developed between our great countries.

Reconciliation, however, must not be confused with the paying of homage to Waffen-SS, the military arm of Hitler's elite guard that was directly responsible for the horror of the Holocaust and the massacre of American soldiers. It is our responsibility to ensure that the Holocaust, the SS, and the reality that was Nazi Germany remain recorded and irreconcilable historical events so that they will not be repeated by future generations for whom they will be only a memory. In that vein, particularly on this 40th anniversary, the Bitburg visit is an especially unfortunate choice and sends, I believe, an inappropriate signal.

The justified concern and criticism surrounding the proposed Bitburg visit have already caused considerable harm to our relationship. For that reason, I recently joined with my friend from New York [Mr. MRAZEK] and 257 House colleagues in writing to Chancellor Kohl, urging that he withdraw his invitation to visit the Bitburg cemetery. I believe that such a gesture by Chancellor Kohl represented the most proper and diplomatic solution to the problem. Unfortunately, Chancellor Kohl's response to that urging makes it clear that we view the Bitburg visit from very different perspectives. As a result, the burden now rests with the President to reassess the Bitburg visit and, for that reason, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 130 as an expression of support for such a reassessment.

Mr. Speaker, there are better ways to express reconciliation and good will between our peoples, and several alternatives have been suggested to the President. Before we move further into a needless quagmire over this unfortunate error in judgment, I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 130 and call on the President to do the right thing, the only thing, that can bring about true reconciliation—cancel Bitburg.●

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my profound support for this amendment.

In the Second World War we and our allies struggled against some of the darkest forces the world has ever seen or experienced. The deeds and the ideology of the Third Reich was in its day and remains today utterly inimical to our principles of respect for human life and individual dignity.

It is true that many of the Nazi soldiers buried at Bitburg died simply following orders. What is more important for us, however, is that they died struggling to uphold the principles and defend the conquered territory of the Third Reich. To honor them by going to Bitburg would mock the sacrifice of those who died or lost loved ones in the struggle to destroy nazism, would cause tremendous anguish for

those who suffered at the Nazis hands, and would give comfort to those who try to soften or deny the horror of the Third Reich. Finally, it would belittle ourselves by showing that we cannot distinguish between soldiers who died for freedom and those who died for nazism.

As we know, some of the soldiers buried at Bitburg were members of the dreaded SS units have organized and ran the extermination camps, performed political assassinations and even slaughtered American prisoners of war near the site of the Bitburg Cemetery. These units were declared to be war criminals by the Nazi War Crimes Tribunal at Nuremberg. As far as I am concerned, the existence of these graves alone should be sufficient ground to keep the President away.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that honoring the memory of the Nazi dead in any way reflects honor on the citizens of present-day Germany. Nor do I believe that not honoring these Nazis dishonors our present-day German allies. The horrors of the Nazi era are separate and distinct from the 40 years of peace and cooperation between the United States and Germany since 1945, and do not at all lessen the value of that partnership.

Should the President wish to emphasize the current friendship between our two countries, he could do so in innumerable ways that do not honor the memory of Nazi and SS soldiers. He could choose, for instance, to inaugurate a school or hospital, or even visit an installation of the present-day West German Armed Forces. Finally if he wished to pay tribute to Germans of the Nazi period, he could honor the memory of those who tried courageously to resist nazism, rather than those who died defending it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Second World War was unquestionably a tragedy for both sides. But it was also unique in world history in the extent of the moral divide that separated the two sides. Let us not acquiesce in the idea that because both sides lost many men, they each merit a tribute by our President. I urge your support for this amendment. Thank you.●

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 130).

The question was taken.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 130, the concurrent resolution just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AGREEMENT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF A FREE TRADE AREA BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-61)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Government Operations, and the Committee on Rules and ordered to be printed.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Monday, April 29, 1985.)

LET US NOT JEOPARDIZE THE LIVES AND SAFETY OF AMERICANS LIVING ABROAD

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the dilatory tactics that we have seen demonstrated today was reminiscent of last week's parliamentary shenanigans by the Republican side should send a—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is reading from a paper in violation of rule XXX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the dilatory tactics of our Republican colleagues is reminiscent of the last week which resulted in the inability of this House to take under consideration the State Department authorization bill, which contained proposed language and authority to provide safety for our American diplomats living abroad. It further provided authority for antiterrorism training so that our Embassies could better provide safety for American diplomats abroad.

The Nation urgently needs this legislation and other bills that have been recommended by the administration in order to run the affairs of our Govern-

ment. I would suggest to our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, that if they wish to continue these dilatory tactics, they do them in ways that does not jeopardize the lives and safety of Americans living abroad.

Mr. Speaker, last week's parliamentary shenanigans by the Republican side should send a clear message to the President that the disarray in his own party now threatens his legislative program.

Because of the planned confusion inflicted by the Republicans last Thursday, we were unable to begin consideration of legislation—requested by the administration—to continue the operations of the Department of State in the next fiscal year. Every Member of this body should view these proceedings with concern. The bill held up last week would have provided much needed authorization for upgrading security at high diplomatic posts around the world, while providing additional authorization for a special antiterrorism training program the State Department is seeking to implement.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in urgent need of this legislation. If the Republican Party insists on going ahead with its plans to disrupt the working of the Congress, I suggest that they target their antics in a way that does not further jeopardize the lives and safety of American diplomats living abroad.

MARXIST ATTEMPT TO MANIPULATE AMERICAN MEDIA

(Mr. MARLENEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days, I have introduced a series of articles from Washington's leading newspaper the Times. These articles have exposed the Marxist Sandinista attempt to manipulate the American media and the American people against aid to the freedom fighters.

The very sanctuary of our churches is being violated by those who promote Marxist dictatorship over democracy.

Many well meaning people who are members of church congregations are being blatantly misled and coerced from behind the pulpit by those who advocate support for the Marxist Sandinistas.

Many clerics are preaching their politics, not their calling in a deliberate one-sided effort to disrupt U.S. policy in Central America. Several church organizations are, and I quote from the Washington Times, "Tightly woven into the network of leftists political groups whose primary goal is to seek radical change in U.S. policy."

I ask my colleagues and fellow church members, is this the kind of message we should be hearing from

those to whom we look for spiritual guidance? A message of support for Marxist dictators whose basic ideology is that there is no God, and who use force to suppress religious freedom.

Today I want to include the last part of the "network" series entitled "Church Groups Bless Sandinista Cause" and appeal to every member of every congregation in America to read and find out the truth about our efforts to promote freedom and democracy in Central America.

The material follows:

"COERCIVE UTOPIANS": CHURCH GROUPS BLESS SANDINISTA CAUSE

(By John Holmes and Ed Rogers)

American church groups, many of which have long histories of involvement in national politics, are turning their attention to Central America in increasing numbers.

And while some church groups remain dedicated almost exclusively to promoting church extension, evangelism and the protection of human rights throughout Central America, others have become more involved in the movement to oppose U.S. foreign policy in the region.

Now, many church groups share common goals, projects, ideology and membership with some leftist political organizations. As a result, they are tightly woven into "The Network" of organizations whose primary goal is to seek radical change in Reagan administration policies in Latin America.

"Church groups in general, and leaders of the Catholic Church in particular, have become the most vocal and persistent opponents of the administration's anti-communist strategy in Central America," the Wall Street Journal reported in a 1983 news report.

Commenting on this church opposition, a senior administration official was quoted in the Journal as saying, "It's the toughest nut we have to crack."

The number of church and religious-affiliated organizations involved in these activities has grown in recent years. Some intelligence experts say that as much as 50 percent of the left-wing Latin American "Network" effort comes from groups and organizations manned, funded or coordinated by elements of some of the nation's major religious denominations.

And in many cases, they say, these groups are more radical, more active and much more heavily funded than their secular counterparts.

These church groups are "the most effective in lobbying . . . because they wear a cloak of legitimacy," said Michael D. Boggs, former director of international affairs at the AFL-CIO.

"They get folks to write letters who don't have the faintest idea what they're talking about," Mr. Boggs was quoted as saying in a 1982 article in Congressional Quarterly.

"The churches are the most active group and the most influential group lobbying against U.S. policy [in Latin America], without any doubt," concurred Kerry Ptacek, research director for the independent Institute for Religion and Democracy (IRD).

"I would say that the churches and their various executive groups were primarily responsible for the initial cutoff of aid to the Contras," he said.

Perhaps most infuriating to critics is that some churches have provided money, credibility and an audience to a host of other groups critical of U.S. policy, ranging from

"human-rights" organizations—such as the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA)—to a network of organizations openly sympathetic to guerrilla movements in Latin America.

"So many left activists are linked up with church groups that it's hard to know what is a real church group," IRD spokesman Penn Kemble said in the Congressional Quarterly story.

Few of the religious/political connections are overt but, in many cases, they are strong. And though some liberal churches maintain their own agenda, it bears strong resemblances to that pursued by many of their political counterparts.

One example of the tie-in between the church and political groups is the link between the National Council of Churches and the North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA). According to a 1984 study by the conservative Heritage Foundation, much of the research used by those who oppose Reagan policy in Central America is derived from NACLA.

NACLA was established in the NCC's offices in Washington in 1966, and receives financial support from numerous Protestant churches through the NCC's Latin American Division and through specific projects such as the Presbyterian hunger program, according to an IRD report.

Other groups, such as the Washington Office on Latin America, also benefit from church funding.

WOLA's 1983 Annual Report, for instance, lists \$124,602 in contributions from religious organizations including the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.; the American Lutheran Church; St. Luke Presbyterian Church; American Baptist Churches, U.S.A.; Board of Global Ministries (United Methodist Church); Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers; Maryknoll Sisters; Jesuit Missions; World Council of Churches; the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.; the Episcopal Church, and others.

The IRD also has documented mainline Protestant church support for radical political movements in the United States and in other nations, including Vietnam.

"Direct NCC involvement with the governments and Communist Party structures of the Indochina region is intense, conscious and on-going," IRD stated in a 1983 report titled, "A Time for Candor: Mainline Churches and Radical Social Witness."

The institute also has reported that the United Methodist Board funds the National Network in Solidarity with the Nicaraguan People, which was founded "to support and defend the Nicaraguan revolution," and other solidarity groups that assist the Salvadoran rebels.

"Support for the pro-Sandinista network in Nicaragua and the United States has come from money collected every Sunday in U.S. churches," the IRD commented in a 1984 report titled, "Church Support for Pro-Sandinista Network."

Primary among its examples is the controversial funding by church agencies of the Evangelical Committee for Aid to Development (CEPAD), which claims to represent Nicaragua's Protestant churches even though it supports the Sandinistas, according to the 1984 report.

Another Nicaraguan Protestant body known as the National Council of Evangelical Pastors (CNPEN), which doesn't support the Sandinistas, has received no funding from the U.S. mainline church agencies, the report states.

(This support for the Nicaraguan Sandinistas appears not to have declined over the years while other prominent supporters of the Sandinistas revolution, such as Robert S. Leiken, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment, have since become disillusioned.)

(Mr. Leiken, writing in the October 1984 issue of *New Republic*, stated that a recent visit to Nicaragua had "convinced me that the situation is far worse than I had thought, and disabused me of some of the remaining myths about the Sandinistas revolution.")

In their 1983 book, "The Coercive Utopians," Rael Jean Isaac and Eric Isaac detail many examples of how church groups fund radical groups in Central America and elsewhere.

Among their accounts is that of David Jessup, an AFL-CIO official and member of the United Methodist Church who, they recount, read aloud in church a letter to President Carter asking for the cancellation of \$5 million in aid to the Salvadoran military.

A subsequent killing of four Catholic churchwomen late that year sent shock waves through the church that have yet to subside.

Since then, many bishops repeatedly have opposed U.S. military aid to El Salvador and have called for negotiations with the communist rebels.

On many occasions, these clerics have preached their politics from the pulpits, and their remarks have been covered extensively in the Catholic press. This has helped to generate an outpouring of mail from priests, nuns and parishioners.

"We don't have a push button that turns on all the dioceses," said Mr. Quigley in the Congressional Quarterly article. But the USCC's Rev. Bryan Hehir noted in the same article, "When the bishops take that kind of leadership, there's bound to be a response."

Mr. Quigley is an example of the interconnection between the church and political groups. According to the Congressional Quarterly article, Mr. Quigley, along with his USCC duties, also has served on the boards of WOLA and the Council on Hemispheric Affairs (COHA), two of the better known groups in The Network that seek to change U.S. policy in Central America.

He also has worked with the Protestant National Council of Churches and helped start the Religious Task Force, which disseminates El Salvador information to a variety of Catholic clergy and laity, the article said.

Within the Catholic Church, the Maryknoll order of missionaries remains one of the most active segments. Maryknoll publications, which have a large Catholic audience in the United States, have for years emphasized El Salvador. The order also has contributed to several groups opposing U.S. policy.

Frequently on the cutting edge of this movement, the Maryknolls also are among the leaders in translating their beliefs onto film. They provided two grants to help produce a film titled "El Salvador: Another Vietnam" and they themselves produced a film called "Roses in December."

"Another Vietnam," which was nominated for an Academy Award in 1982, portrays the civilian-military regime as the culprit in El Salvador, and the message in "Roses," which tells the story of the four churchwomen killed in El Salvador in 1980 . . . In the states, their letter-writing campaigns, teach-ins and demonstrations at some college campuses are a "mainstay" in Catholic opposition to U.S. involvement.

Some of the Catholic and Protestant church groups also are actively involved in sponsoring trips by American legislators, clerics and laymen to Central America. Though some of these trips have been highly publicized and apparently have had a strong impact on those who went, several groups have been sharply criticized for allegedly staging "slanted" tours.

The Boston-based Unitarian Universalist Service Committee has made "significant impact," according to the Congressional Quarterly story, by underwriting several congressional "study trips" to El Salvador, which usually include visits with rebels and other dissidents.

Reps. Gerry, Studds, D-Mass.; Thomas Petri, R-Wis.; and William Coyne, D-Pa., were among those who have gone on the trips.

Rep. Coyne later said the trip on which he went was a "political exercise" for his host and chided them for playing down abuse by the Latin American left, according to the Congressional Quarterly article.

Last month, two women who participated in a trip to Nicaragua sponsored by the American Lutheran Church Women complained in a written report to Rep. Vin Weber, R-Minn., that the trip had been turned into "two weeks of intensive anti-United States, pro-Sandinista indoctrination."

As many as 200 churches across the country also are involved in a "sanctuary" movement, in which illegal immigrants from Central America are clandestinely brought into the United States and hidden from Immigration and Naturalization Service agents who might seek their deportation, according to Elliott Abrams, assistant secretary of state for human rights and humanitarian affairs.

But wrote the Rev. Philip C. Cleary, chairman of the Association of Chicago Priests, "these refugees are quite literally fleeing for their lives. They are fleeing civil war and repressive governments that have been bolstered by the United States government."

"After fleeing such repression, to be sent back to their countries by the INS often means persecution, torture or death. For the INS to deport such refugees is completely immoral," Rev. Cleary wrote in 1982.

A study produced in January by the Washington-based Mid-Atlantic Research Associates states that the churches have been drawn into the movement by leftist groups whose real goal is overthrow of El Salvador's government.

"The national sanctuary movement is coordinated by supporters of Central America's Soviet- and Cuban-backed revolutionaries who have been engaged in a terrorist 'armed struggle' since the 1960s," the study said.

In a recent interview with *The Times*, Mr. Abrams cited a number of documents distributed by sanctuary movement organizations as "proof" that the movement's leaders "do not exclusively have human rights goals."

"They have political goals," he said, adding that their main target is to disrupt U.S. policy in Central America.

TIES BETWEEN FMLN, GUERRILLAS IN EL SALVADOR AND SANDINISTA REGIME IN NICARAGUA

(Mr. LAGOMARSINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and

extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, I made a 1-minute speech referring to a newspaper article describing documents captured by the Salvadoran Army on April 18, 1985. Since then, I have had the opportunity to see photocopies of those documents and read the translations of them. I am inserting into the *RECORD* a summary of those documents as well as the translation of one of those documents which is a letter from the Salvadoran guerrilla headquarters to the "Comrades of the National Directorate of the FSLN."

This letter is a clear indication of the direct ties between the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua and the FMLN guerrillas in El Salvador. In particular, I would like to quote several sentences from that document:

The Sandinista popular revolution and the Salvadoran revolutionary movement are the most sensitive points in Central America and they could bog down the present Reagan administration. That is why we support the current diplomatic initiatives of the FSLN to gain time, to help Reagan's opposition in the United States, and to internationally isolate his aggressive plan towards Nicaragua and El Salvador.

It also states:

We also consider that, given the level of our confrontation with imperialism and the puppet forces, our process requires a much higher level of logistic assistance. We believe that present circumstances are favorable to take daring steps in this direction.

ANALYSIS OF SOME OF THE DOCUMENTS CAPTURED BY SALVADORAN ARMY, APRIL 18, 1985

SUMMARY

We have analyzed a few of the documents captured from guerrillas of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN) by the Salvadoran army on April 18, 1985. Even this small sampling confirms much of what we have been saying about the continuing mutual support between the Nicaraguan government and the Salvadoran FMLN. A letter from the top FMLN leaders to the National Directorate of the Sandinista Front for National Liberation—FSLN refers to the logistical support given the FMLN by the Sandinistas. The letter also expresses support by the FMLN for decision by the Sandinista leadership to influence the United States electoral campaign by supporting President Reagan's opponents. Other documents refer to links to refugee camps in Honduras, to the Honduran Communist Workers Revolutionary Party (PRTC-H) to infiltration routes through Honduras to Nicaragua, Guatemala and Mexico, obtaining Honduran identity documents, and training courses for FMLN guerrillas in various communist countries.

The view of FMLN that the struggle in Central America is one between the forces of the democratic states led by the United States versus those of the communist world (they use "imperialism" vs. "socialist camp") emerges from the documents.

The impact of the United States success in Grenada is clear in several of the documents as was their belief in late 1983 that the United States would take direct action

against Nicaragua. Plans were made to shift Salvadoran guerrilla military units to locations in the east (La Union) so that they could join in the fighting in Nicaragua and to transfer money and other materials (obviously from Nicaragua) to El Salvador so as not to lose them. One document indicated that this would be a joint decision of the FSLN and the FMLN.

PROOF OF NICARAGUAN COOPERATION WITH AND SUPPORT FOR THE SALVADORAN FMLN

The letter from the top leaders of the Salvadoran FMLN to the National Directorate of the Nicaraguan FSLN dated November 24, 1983 (in response to a report received from the FSLN) shows unmistakably that Nicaragua has been providing logistical support for the FMLN in El Salvador, and states the need for a "higher level" of assistance. It also states that the FMLN leadership considers "that coordination and cooperation between us (the FMLN and FSLN) is of the highest priority. . . ."

INTERFERENCE IN THE U.S. ELECTIONS

The November 24, 1983 letter from the FMLN to the FSLN, states the FMLN's agreement with the Sandinistas that, in view of the electoral campaign in the United States, this was "the appropriate moment to influence the American electorate." The FMLN leaders stated that they would support the diplomatic initiatives of the FSLN government and the FSLN's help to "Reagan's opposition in the United States."

WAR WITHOUT FRONTIERS

The November 24, 1983 letter also pledges that in the event of an invasion FMLN guerrillas would fight anywhere in Central America "without regard to the territorial limits of our countries."

ACTIVITIES IN HONDURAS

We have numerous reports of FSLN and FMLN activities in Honduras, including the infiltration from Nicaragua into Honduras of Hondurans trained in Cuba and Nicaragua. Two of these attempts to send groups of 90-100 armed men into Honduras were discovered by Honduran security forces occurred in July 1983 and in mid-1984. We also have reports showing the use of the Colomacagua and Mesa Grand refugee camps in Honduras by Salvadoran guerrillas as sources of medical and food supplies and as rest and recreation centers for guerrillas who are rotated from combat to the camps for short periods. The Salvadoran army during raids on guerrilla encampments frequently finds caches of supplies bearing markings indicated they were provided by the United Nations High Commission on Refugees (UNHCR) to the refugee camps.

Among the documents captured on April 18 was an agenda for a "meeting with H of O" relating to operations and activities in Honduras. The Colomacagua refugee camp is mentioned in it, but no details are given. Also "pasos ciegos" (infiltration routes) to Guatemala, Mexico and Nicaragua are mentioned, as is the subject of Honduran documentation. We have had previous reports of how Salvadoran guerrillas are able to obtain Honduran identification documents by bribing low-level officials, forgery or use of stolen documents. These documents enable some FMLN personnel to travel freely and organize in Honduras without attracting the attention of Honduran authorities. Also mentioned in the agenda is "Relations with the PRTC-H," an obvious reference to the FMLN's relations with the Revolutionary Communist Workers Party of Honduras.

SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE LAUNCHER

Among the documents captured is a diagram of a portable SAM-7 missile launcher, obviously used to instruct guerrillas in the use of the anti-aircraft missile launcher.

TRAINING IN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Also captured were lists of persons selected from the PRTC of El Salvador, one of the groups in the FMLN, for training in Vietnam, the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, and East Germany. There also were mini-biographic records of some PRTC militants, indicating, among other things, their training in Cuba.

[Translation]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
DIVISION OF LANGUAGE SERVICES,
El Salvador, November 24, 1983.

COMRADES OF THE NATIONAL DIRECTORATE OF THE FSLN: Fraternal and revolutionary greetings!

We have recently received from the FSLN Commission on Foreign Affairs a report on new diplomatic demarches you are carrying out.

Our evaluation is as follows:

1. We are in agreement in that the electoral period in the United States is the appropriate moment to influence the American electorate. The Sandinista Popular Revolution and the Salvadorean Revolutionary Movement are the most sensitive points in Central America and they could bog down the present Reagan administration.

That is why we support the current diplomatic initiatives of the FSLN to gain time, to help Reagan's opposition in the United States, and to internationally isolate his aggressive plan towards Nicaragua and El Salvador.

2. We consider that the joint efforts of the Socialist Camp, the National Liberation Movements, and all the Progressive Forces constitute the guaranty of the defeat of the warmongering and aggressive policy of Reagan.

3. It is also necessary to establish as a principle that the determining factor for our liberation process, as well as for the defense of Nicaragua, is the internal consolidation of the Sandinista Popular Revolution. That is why all the measures you are taking to incorporate all the people to the task of defense and the strengthening of the EPS are crucially important. The reasoning you are applying which affirms that the defeat of the imperialistic aggression is only possible through a true people's war is correct.

At this time, the highest priority for the FSLN is to continue and aggravate the wearing away of the enemy forces which in turn will allow us to enter that situation with our political and military forces better developed and consolidated, and with a larger capacity to bog down the aggression if it were to happen.

4. In view of the above, we consider that coordination and cooperation between us is of the highest priority, although this does not imply that measures taken have to be identical in both situations, but rather that they should be combined dialectically to permit us to move forward.

In our own case at this time, given the non-negotiating position of the imperialists and the dominant national classes, the dialogue does not play an important role in our diplomatic battles, but rather the efforts to muster international pressure to stop CONDECA's and the U.S.'s intervention and to build a large movement of solidarity towards our struggle.

5. We also consider that, given the level of our confrontation with imperialism and the puppet forces, our process requires a much higher level of logistic assistance. We believe that present circumstances are favorable to take daring steps in this direction.

Finally, we place great value on the new measure of our relations and in the search for a higher level of coordination that will multiply the potential of our two peoples in the historical struggle to defeat the imperialist intervention.

Comrades of the National Board, we are sure of the success of your work in defense of the Revolution.

United to Fight Until the Final Victory!!!
Revolution or Death! We shall Win!!!

FMLN GENERAL
HEADQUARTERS:
CMDR. SHAFIK JORGE
HANDAL.
CMDR. JOAQUIN
VILLALOBOS.
CMDR. ROBERTO ROCA.
CMDR. LEONEL GONZALES.

TIME TO PUT FAIRNESS AND INTEGRITY ABOVE PARTISAN POLITICS

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is time to put fairness and integrity above partisan politics.

It is abundantly clear that the recount in Indiana's Eighth District came to an abrupt ending only when Democrat Frank McCloskey reached a 4-vote lead, also there were 42 ballots left to count. Even James Shumway, the Democrat-appointed recount supervisor, said the ballots not counted were indistinguishable on any legal basis or security basis from the ballots the task force had previously counted.

Mr. Speaker, the integrity and fairness of the Democratic Party is on the line. I sincerely hope my friends on the other side of the aisle will summon the courage to put fairness and integrity above party.

The New York Times, the Washington Post, the Washington Times, the Baltimore Sun, the Philadelphia Inquirer, and dozens of other responsible media are right. To seat Mr. McCloskey would be unjust, unfair, and undeserved.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following excerpts from several editorials calling for a new election in Indiana:

From the New York Times: The problem is that the recounts have been hopelessly tainted by the appearance of partisanship . . . Wisdom and fairness argue for a special election.—April 26, 1985

From the Wall Street Journal: There is simply no way the Democrats can look good saying a Democrat's four-vote victory is valid after they said a Republican's 400-vote victory was invalid.—April 22, 1985

From the Wall Street Journal: At some point, House Democrats are going to have to show they can survive into the future with-

out the help of a lot of highly publicized political finagling. A good start would be to vote next week for a new Indiana election and let Frank McCloskey show how a Democrat can earn his way into the House as an elected congressman, not as one of Tip's bananas.—April 24, 1985

From the Evansville, IN, Press: The recount . . . simply stopped 25 votes short of the end . . . Unless those votes—all the votes—are counted, those shouting for a special election . . . may more and more begin sounding like the voices of reason who have the candidates' best interests at heart.—April 20, 1985

From the Washington Post: In an election so close, neither contestant should be seated. The House, embroiled in an ear-splitting dispute over the outcome, should in fact declare the seat vacant and let Indiana hold another election.—April 23, 1985

From the Detroit News: Democrats evidently accepted those rules until their man crept ahead—and then quit.

House Republicans are rightly outraged about all this. Never before in American history has Congress ignored the certified results of an election that was conducted without allegations of fraud.—April 23, 1985

From the Denver Post: With a 70-vote House majority, Democrats hardly need to worry about losing one seat. But in their blind frenzy to protect one of their own, they've trampled on the rights of 500,000 Hoosiers to a voice in Congress.—April 1, 1985

From the Philadelphia Inquirer: Yet after so many contested recounts and partisan power plays, the only way to purge the taint of suspicion that either party stole the seat is to hold a new election, and the sooner the better.—April 24, 1985

From the Baltimore Sun: This was a virtual dead heat—and no winner ought to be declared. Otherwise, people will have another reason to be cynical about politics, and Mr. McCloskey will take his seat under a cloud.—April 22, 1985

From the Bakersfield Californian: There is no way the Democrats can come out with the good conduct medal by saying a Democrat's four-vote victory is valid after they said a Republican's 400-vote victory was invalid.—April 23, 1985

From the Washington Times: Mr. McIntyre was twice certified the winner by the Indiana secretary of state. His margin of victory increased with each recount until the one managed by Mr. McCloskey's party in the House. If you think you detect the odor of fish, you're probably right.—April 23, 1985

From the Florida Times-Union: The Republican candidate was certified. In 81 disputed cases during the last 50 years the certified winner has always been seated provisionally.

There are enough discrepancies in this case to give the House reason to pause. As painful as it may be, the House should set aside partisan considerations and let a special election determine who deserves the seat.—April 23, 1985

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SCS

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago our Nation made a commitment to protect and preserve the soil

and water resources of our country. This commitment was made to prevent our Nation from ever having to relive the hardship of another Dust Bowl.

April 27, 1985, marks the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the first permanent legislation to authorize the establishment of soil and water conservation programs by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The success of these programs is testimony to the hard work of our Nation's Soil Conservation Service and its employees. They are to be congratulated and commended for their record of the past 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise to express my support for soil and water conservation, and to express, on behalf of farmers and ranchers, the concern that soil conservation efforts continue.

Despite the expenditure over the last 50 years, the most recent SCS natural resource inventory identified 245 million acres of cropland—over 58 percent of the total—as needing some type of conservation treatment.

To say that this Nation's soil and water conservation programs have not been effective because we spend \$800 million per year on conservation and that 58 percent of our cropland still needs some type of conservation treatment is like saying we shouldn't spend money on health care and doctors services because people are still getting sick.

For example, in 1984, Kansas farmers practiced conservation tillage on nearly 11.8 million acres—that's a 13-percent increase from 1983 when Kansas ranked first in the Nation in conservation tillage and had 12 percent of the Nation's conservation tillage acreage. And, some 20 counties developed independent conservation tillage committees that kept the public information on the importance of conservation tillage in erosion control and more productive farming. In that respect, conservation doesn't cost. It pays.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the history of SCS. This year we will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Act of 1935. Congress passed this legislation at a time when this Nation was in the grips of the Great Depression and Dust Bowl. The fertile plains were literally drying up and blowing away.

During these "Dirty Thirties," the entire Great Plains region and real wealth of this Nation—our soil and water resources—were being threatened by destruction from wind and soil erosion. Congress created the Soil Conservation Service and this dedicated agency went to work.

Soil and water conservation is an investment in America's future and not a cost. Despite current surpluses, we have only to look at the continent of Africa to be reminded that our vast abundance of natural resources will be

needed in the future to feed an ever growing and hungry world population.

Mr. Speaker, I know we are faced with a budget crisis of enormous proportions. Every farmer in this Nation has been squeezed by the record budget deficits which have led to high real rates of interest and an overvaluation of the U.S. dollar. This, in turn, has led to U.S. agricultural commodities being priced out of world markets.

However, the answer in our attempt to control spending is certainly not the elimination of the Soil Conservation Service. I call my colleagues attention to the recent action of the Agriculture Committee. In their consideration of the USDA's fiscal year 1986 budget, we recommend to the Budget Committee that the Soil Conservation Service and other USDA programs be funded at last year's level. This is not as much as we need for soil conservation, but it is a commitment both to deficit control and to conserving our natural resources.

As we reflect on the Soil Conservation Service's past 50 years preserving our Nation's most valuable resource, I urge my colleagues to adopt this approach.

BLUE RIBBON PANEL TO DEAL WITH WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

(Mr. DICKINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that almost daily we read another horror story in the press about the waste, fraud, and abuse within the Department of Defense with regard to contractors dealing with the Department of Defense. I do not think anyone can question my credentials as to being a strong supporter of defense.

For this reason, though, Mr. Speaker, I feel there is an eroding confidence in the American people in our ability—our being the Federal Government, dealing with the Executive, the Congress, and the Department of Defense, to manage our affairs when it comes to maintaining a strong defense posture.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I have written to the President of the United States urging that he appoint a blue ribbon panel, similar to the Scowcroft Commission, of the most prestigious people that he can find to come together and to deal with the problem, which is bigger than the Department of Defense and bigger than any particular agency of Government.

I think then and only then can we show the American people we are capable of first defining the problem

and, second, coming up with a solution to deal with it.

I think when we do that, we will again establish our capability, our credibility, and we will once again capture the support and the confidence of the American people.

Anything short of that, Mr. Speaker, I think will be viewed as just another Band-Aid on the big problems that we see.

I urge the President to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I include the letter that I have sent to the President:

APRIL 1, 1985.

The President,

The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT. The purpose of this letter is to recommend that you establish a Presidential Blue Ribbon Panel on Government Procurement Reform.

I feel that the present situation regarding the perceptions of the government procurement process, especially in the defense sector, is intolerable.

The almost daily revelation of action and alleged abuses of the system is, in reality, diverting the debating on defense from the proper direction. Instead of debating the need for a strong defense, many critics are citing these sensational revelations as prime reasons to cut the defense effort. Reasoned debate about the need for a strong defense is lost in the rhetoric surrounding waste, fraud, and abuse.

The continual drumbeat of adverse publicity which generates public outcry also engenders ad hoc and fragmented approaches aimed at correcting the situation. Various aspects of defense procurement are being separately addressed, legislated, and changed. Policies and legislation mandating warranties, spare parts competition, overhead charges certification of allowable costs, withholding of progress payments, suspensions of contractors, increased cost reporting, etc., are being imposed in an uncoordinated and reactive manner.

I certainly recognize there are abuses of the system which must be rooted out and fully prosecuted if appropriate, but I refuse to believe the situation is as bad as the popular press would have the American people believe.

Mr. President, our citizens are looking to this administration for leadership in this area. We have the opportunity to respond to the public concern and turn the situation into a positive force for review and reform of the government acquisition process.

Ideally, the Blue Ribbon Procurement Panel I recommend should be a bipartisan effort with clearly defined goals eventually including proposed legislative changes. Panel membership could include representatives of business and government.

In the interests of national defense, Mr. President, I urge that you establish such a panel as soon as possible. If you decide to act on my suggestion, I will support your efforts in any way you deem appropriate.

Sincerely,

WM L. DICKINSON.

THE TRADE DEFICIT

(Mr. BONKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Department of Commerce will announce the trade deficit for the previous month. It is bound to be another record setter, as it is every month that they release these figures.

The trade deficit for last year was \$123 billion and it is expected to soar to \$150 billion this year.

There are other statistics flowing out of the Department of Commerce, including one that shows that consumer demand is up rather dramatically, but at the same time the GNP growth is down. The difference is being made up by imports.

The major cause of the trade deficit can be laid at the doorstep of the overvalued dollar. Ambassador Brock, before he left that Department, has told us that the overvalued dollar is responsible for about 80 percent of the trade deficit.

Mr. Speaker, to date the administration appears to have no strategy or policy to deal with our trade problems. Later this week he will journey to Bonn where he will participate in the upcoming economic summit. I hope that he will join his fellow Heads of State and deal with this overvalued and currency misalignment problem.

Later I will be introducing legislation that will be a sense of Congress that the President should take up this issue when he attends the meeting in Bonn later this week.

Mr. Speaker, the sense-of-Congress resolution I intend to offer is as follows:

Whereas the magnitude and growth of the United States merchandise trade deficit, which reached \$123.3 billion in 1984, is unsustainable and could result in United States indebtedness to foreign interests approaching \$1 trillion by the end of this decade;

Whereas the United States balance of trade in manufactured goods has deteriorated from a surplus of \$5.3 billion in 1981 to a deficit of \$88.7 billion in 1984;

Whereas United States agricultural exports have declined more than \$5.5 billion since 1981;

Whereas unprecedented Federal budget deficits have contributed significantly to persistently high real interest rates and an enormous real appreciation of the United States dollar against major foreign currencies;

Whereas the inflated value of the dollar is a major cause of the massive trade deficit of the United States by effectively acting as a heavy tax on United States exports and a costly subsidy of imports;

Whereas the inflated dollar is causing United States manufacturing enterprises to reduce domestic production by purchasing more component parts from foreign sources and by making more capital investments outside the United States;

Whereas this development is weakening the productive capability of the United States and is costing the United States millions of jobs;

Whereas the inflated dollar is exacerbating the present crisis in farming in the United States by substantially inhibiting United States agricultural exports;

Whereas a fair share of world markets is essential to present and future United States prosperity and job growth;

Whereas the existing free-floating exchange rate system is proving incapable of assuring fair and reasonable terms of trade; and

Whereas at the 1983 economic summit in Williamsburg, Virginia, the President made a commitment to "define the conditions for improving the international monetary system and to consider the part which might, in due course, be played in this process by a high-level international monetary conference"; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the President should make the overvalued dollar, the growing United States trade deficit, and cooperative measures to redress these grave imbalances a top priority of the economic summit meeting to begin in Bonn, West Germany, on May 2, 1985; and

(2) as part of this effort, the President should seek specific assurances and commitments from participating governments to—

(A) join with the United States in gradually reducing the inflated foreign exchange value of the United States dollar;

(B) take immediate steps to stimulate domestic demand and business investment in their respective economies; and

(C) convene a multilateral conference before the end of 1985 to ensure greater stability in exchange rate movements.

SEC. 2. The President is requested to report to the Congress, within 45 days after the end of the economic summit meeting in Bonn, West Germany, on the results of his efforts to achieve the goals described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of the first section of this resolution.

□ 1520

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent during certain votes taken on Thursday, April 25, 1985.

On rollcall No. 70, the House approved the Journal of the prior day's proceedings, by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 to 177. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 71, the House authorized the reading of a paper, by a yea-and-nay vote of 351 to 14. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 72, the House agreed to the resolution (H. Res. 137) providing for the consideration of the bill authorizing appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies, by a yea-and-nay vote of 383 to 0, with one Member voting present. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 73, the House agreed to table the motion to reconsider the vote by which House Resolution 137 was agreed to, by a yea-and-nay vote of 212 to 157, with one Member voting

present. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 74, the House voted to sustain a ruling of the Chair with respect to the RECORD, by a ye-and-nay vote of 200 to 156. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 75, the House agreed to a motion to adjourn, by a ye-and-nay vote of 201 to 153. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, also I was necessarily absent during a procedural vote taken this morning. On rollcall No. 76, the House approved the Journal of the prior day's proceedings, by a ye-and-nay of 158 to 130, with three Members voting present. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."●

A TRIBUTE TO JACK DEPPNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise before the body to pay tribute to one of Central Florida's finest humanitarians, Jack Deppner.

For over two decades, Jack Deppner has inspired the youth of our Nation to excel both intellectually and athletically.

Born and raised in Miamisburg, OH, Jack Deppner graduated from Dayton University and began his career in the Dayton school system. Although he taught gymnastics and biology during the school year, Jack spent his summers coaching diving at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

In 1968, Jack and his wife moved to central Florida where he taught elementary school at Patrick Air Force Base. After serving for 3 years, he transferred to Hoover Junior High School in Cocoa Beach, FL, where he was selected as Teacher of the Year for 1981-82. Jack also served two terms as the Brevard County Historical Society president.

Several of Coach Deppner's students have excelled in international competition. Jan Pope, a Deppner student in the sixties, was a medal winner in the Pan Am games. Sam Hall and Tom Gomph both competed in the Tokyo Olympics and won gold and silver medals respectively. Jack Deppner's latest accomplishment came when Kathy Johnson of Indialantic, FL, won the bronze medal in the balance beam competition in the 1984 Summer Olympics in Los Angeles.

It is a pleasure to recognize the talents of this gifted individual from my congressional district.●

LEGISLATION TO END PROHIBITION OF MEDICAL USE OF MARIJUANA FOR SERIOUSLY ILL AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. McKINNEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing for the third time legislation to end the unnecessary and unjust prohibition of the medical use of marijuana for seriously ill Americans, namely, those suffering from cancer and glaucoma. Congressional inaction on this legislation in the past has allowed the continued suffering of those cancer and glaucoma patients who would benefit from the therapeutic use of marijuana. This suffering easily could be alleviated through responsible action.

The bill I am introducing today is the vehicle for such responsible action; it would allow the controlled medical use of marijuana only by cancer and glaucoma patients. Many of the drugs which doctors prescribe daily are considered dangerous, abusable drugs. Nonetheless, they are recognized for their medical value and are treated accordingly by Federal law. My legislation recognizes marijuana's well-established medical value, and adapts Federal law to allow its medical use. The Federal regulation of drugs must be distinguished between social abuse and medical use. Currently, marijuana is a schedule I drug under the Control Substances Act. Schedule I includes those drugs considered to have no accepted medical use in the United States. This legislation would reschedule marijuana to schedule II, a category which contains those drugs, despite being abusable, that have an acceptable medical use.

As many of my colleagues know, 33 States have enacted legislation allowing the medical use of marijuana. However, these farsighted laws have either been impossible to implement or severely limited in scope due to outdated Federal laws and unresponsive policies. Several States, through resolutions passed in their legislatures or with language contained in State therapeutic marijuana program reports, have strongly urged passage of Federal legislation. It is time that Congress recognize what a majority of our States have already acknowledged—the successful use of, and need for, the medical use of marijuana.

Many cancer and glaucoma patients deserve to receive relief from proper applications of medical marijuana. The applications would both reduce the sickening after effects and loss of appetite associated with anticancer therapies. The National Cancer Institute [NCI] estimates that 800,000 to 1 million new cases of cancer are diagnosed in the United States each year. Of these numbers, NCI estimates that

250,000 or more will undergo radiation treatments. Over half of those being treated will suffer intense and uncontrollable nausea and vomiting, known clinically as emesis.

Presently, two drugs are commonly used as antiemetics for persons undergoing anticancer therapies; compazine and a synthetic form of delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol [THC]. Yet for most patients, these drugs fail to provide adequate relief. By contrast, medical use of marijuana has proven much more successful. Data revealed by States, who managed to organize and manage marijuana therapy programs despite Federal disincentives, indicate a high success rate. For example, success rates of the programs in New Mexico, Michigan, Tennessee, and New York have been reported to be between 80 and 90 percent—much higher than rates of conventional drugs. With such high success rates, it is inconceivable that unfounded fears and inept Government procedures prevent warranted remedy, prolonging the suffering of so many Americans.

Glaucoma, a leading cause of blindness, is the general name given to an ill-defined group of eye diseases. Glaucoma is incurable, but may be controlled either by drugs or surgery. The National Eye Institute [NEI] estimates that 2 million Americans are experiencing this affliction. Many of those afflicted, however, are unable to receive adequate relief which application of marijuana could bring about. The medical use of marijuana in treatment of glaucoma patients has been proven useful due to its ability to lower intraocular pressure. Intraocular pressure, if unrelieved, causes damage to the optic nerve resulting in blindness. In addition, marijuana enhances the utility of other control medications used for glaucoma.

While the evidence grows in support of using marijuana in certain medical situations, the human need for medical marijuana application becomes more dire. Mr. Speaker, I know of too many instances when cancer or glaucoma patients have suffered or are suffering unnecessarily; I am sure many of my colleagues know of similar cases. The conscience of Congress demands an expedient response to prevent this tragic occurrence in our country. By supporting this legislation, let us begin to make the necessary distinction between the medical use of, and the social abuse of, marijuana. Let us begin to meet the needs and respect the dignity of so many suffering Americans.●

INTRODUCTION OF AMENDED "FAIR AND SIMPLE TAX" REFORM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with Mr. LOTT, a slightly amended version of the Kemp-Kasten-Lott "Fair and Simple Tax" (FAST: H.R. 2222). The basic thrust is the same: Lowering the tax rates, broadening the tax base, expanding family-oriented deductions, and instituting a new exclusion for wage and salary income.

Aside from some technical corrections, the main policy changes concern the tax treatment of the working poor and of the domestic mineral industry.

FURTHER HELP FOR THE WORKING POOR

One of the features of the Kemp-Kasten-Lott "Fair and Simple Tax," of which I am most proud, is its tax relief for the working poor. For example, our bill, like its earlier version, raises the tax-free level of income for a traditional family of four from \$9,440 to \$14,125—that is, from nearly \$2,000 below to about \$3,000 above the poverty level. Earlier versions of our bill would remove about 1½ million of the lowest-income taxpayers from the income tax rolls.

Nevertheless, we have not stopped thinking of ways to improve the tax treatment of the working poor. The new bill contains two especially important changes. First, we have substantially raised the zero-bracket amount for single heads of household, from \$2,480 under current law to \$3,200 (all figures are for 1986). This raises the income tax threshold for a single parent with one child from \$4,640 to \$9,000 (not including the earned income tax credit).

Second, we have made a number of innovative changes in the earned income tax credit to increase work incentives at low incomes and support intact families with children. Our plan establishes three important principles, of which the first two were strongly recommended yesterday by Robert B. Carleson in testimony before the House Select Committee on Children Youth and Families' Task Force on Economic Security. I am grateful to him for his contribution.

First, our bill ties the percentage of the earned income tax credit to the combined employer/employee Social Security payroll tax. For 1986, this means that the credit is increased from 11 percent under current law to 14.3 percent under Kemp-Kasten-Lott. This explicitly recognizes that the earned income tax credit is not welfare, but a refund of taxes already paid by families who earn their own income. The credit was originally set at 10 percent of income because that was approximately the combined payroll tax rate at the time. But the payroll tax has risen substantially since then. Therefore we should increase the credit in step with the payroll tax.

Second, our new bill relates the maximum earned income tax credit for the first time to the size of a family. Under current law, the credit is the same for a single parent with one child as for a family of three, four, five. Our new bill starts phasing out the credit at \$4,500 for a family of two, \$5,000 for a family of three, and \$5,500 for a family of four or more persons. Basing this on the number of persons in the family rather than the number of children gives an edge to intact families with both parents living together.

Third, our bill retains the important principle contained in our earlier bill, that the earned income tax credit should be fully phased out before taxpayers reach the bottom tax bracket. This is important for keeping down the high marginal tax rates on the poor, because phasing out the credit effectively raises the marginal tax rate; when this overlaps with the bottom tax brackets, it can result in high tax rates at low incomes. For example, under current law, the Treasury plan and the Bradley-Gephardt plan, many taxpayers earning less than \$11,000 face Federal marginal tax rates of 30 percent to 35 percent, due to the combination of the ordinary income tax, the employee's share of the payroll tax, and the phaseout of the EITC. This occurs when the taxpayers reach the income tax brackets before the EITC is phased out at \$11,000. This only makes it more difficult for low-income people to work their way out of poverty.

Under Kemp-Kasten-Lott, no taxpayer in this range would face a combined marginal tax rate higher than 26 percent, because the EITC is always phased out before the taxpayer reaches the bottom tax bracket. For example, the credit for two-person families is phased out at about \$8,800, for three-person families at about \$9,700, and for families with four or more persons at about \$10,750. These levels, are below the income tax thresholds under Kemp-Kasten-Lott, respectively, of \$9,000 for a single parent with one child, \$11,500 for a family of three, and \$14,000 for a family of four. (The figures refer to single-parent families; the tax-free levels for two-parent families of the same size—that is, with one fewer dependent—are slightly higher.)

Though the EITC is phased out somewhat sooner under Kemp-Kasten-Lott than under current law, the tax burden is lower in almost every case because the percentage is larger, and because Kemp-Kasten-Lott substantially raises the income tax threshold. (See table 1.)

DOMESTIC MINERAL INDUSTRY

The new bill retains current law treatment of intangible drilling costs, percentage depletion allowances, and mineral development costs. I believe these changes are necessary to encour-

age domestic energy and mineral supply. They are especially important because the mineral industry is severely depressed, becoming dangerously dependent on foreign sources thus threatening our security. More than 60 percent of our operable drilling rigs are idle. Yet merely to replace depleting domestic oil reserves we need to drill 100,000 new wells a year, almost double current rates. Last year, the United States spent \$60 billion to import foreign oil.

Meanwhile, our Government plans to spend \$7.9 billion more to subsidize synthetic fuels, \$17.8 billion to store oil in a strategic petroleum reserve, and current tax law contains \$5 billion in energy conservation tax credits through 1989. If we, as a nation, believe energy is important enough to spend this much to replace our domestic energy, it is certainly equally important to produce domestic energy and provide incentives for the exploration and production of new sources of energy.

The main change concerns the treatment of intangible drilling costs. Current law permits expensing these costs—deducting them in 1 year rather than over many years—because they do not result in any recoverable property value. Our earlier bill provided expensing-equivalent for intangible drilling costs. This meant that the costs were treated like investments in depreciable property under Kemp-Kasten's Neutral Cost Recovery System (NCRS): the deductions were spread out over several years, but the total deductions were increased according to inflation plus a real rate of return. For example, instead of writing off \$1,000 of expenses in 1 year, the earlier bill allowed \$1,153 to be written off over 4 years, assuming 5 percent inflation. What economists call the "present value"—the value of the deductions adjusted for the nominal rate of return over time—was the same in both cases: \$1,000, assuming a 3.5-percent real rate of return. Only the timing or the "cash flow" was different.

However, after explaining all aspects of this issue and discussions with experts in the oil and gas industry, it became clear to me that the current law treatment would be better for the small independent oil and gas drillers who drill and discover most of the oil and gas in this country. For independent oil producers, unlike the big oil companies, there is an important difference between expensing and expensing-equivalent: the difficulty of borrowing from the banking system to finance the high-risk venture of oil exploration. This is a difficulty not faced by big oil companies or other large and well-established corporations. This amended bill will remove the problem, and greatly encourage much-needed

domestic energy and mineral production.

This new bill is a progrowth, projob and profamily tax bill which can help

move both the debate and the economy forward to new levels of employment and opportunity for America.

TABLE 1.—KEMP-KASTEN AND THE WORKING POOR (COMPARISON WITH 1986 CURRENT LAW, FEDERAL INCOME TAX)

	1 parent, 1 child			1 parent, 2 children			2 parents, 1 child			1 parent, 3 children			2 parents, 2 children		
	Current law	Kemp-Kasten	Change	Current law	Kemp-Kasten	Change	Current law	Kemp-Kasten	Change	Current law	Kemp-Kasten	Change	Current law	Kemp-Kasten	Change
Income:															
\$1,000	—\$110	—\$143	—\$33	—\$110	—\$143	—\$33	—\$110	—\$143	—\$33	—\$110	—\$143	—\$33	—\$110	—\$143	—\$33
\$2,000	—220	—286	—66	—220	—286	—66	—220	—286	—66	—220	—286	—66	—220	—286	—66
\$3,000	—330	—429	—99	—330	—429	—99	—330	—429	—99	—330	—429	—99	—330	—429	—99
\$4,000	—440	—572	—132	—440	—572	—132	—440	—572	—132	—440	—572	—132	—440	—572	—132
\$5,000	—510	—569	—59	—550	—715	—165	—550	—715	—165	—550	—715	—165	—550	—715	—165
\$6,000	—400	—419	—19	—519	—565	—46	—550	—565	—15	—550	—630	—80	—550	—630	—80
\$7,000	—228	—269	—41	—348	—415	—67	—479	—415	64	—467	—480	—13	—489	—480	9
\$8,000	14	—119	—133	—115	—265	—150	—247	—265	—18	—234	—330	—96	—366	—330	36
\$9,000	256	0	—256	127	—115	—242	—15	—115	—100	2	—180	—182	—133	—180	—47
\$10,000	515	192	—323	369	0	—369	226	0	—226	240	—30	—270	99	—30	—129
\$11,000	778	384	—394	627	0	—627	468	0	—468	482	0	—482	339	0	—339
\$12,000	931	576	—355	767	96	—671	600	72	—328	616	0	—616	459	0	—459
\$13,000	1,101	788	—333	917	288	—629	740	264	—476	756	0	—756	588	0	—588
\$14,000	1,271	960	—311	1,087	480	—607	890	456	—424	904	144	—760	728	0	—728
\$15,000	1,441	1,152	—289	1,257	672	—585	1,020	648	—372	1,074	192	—882	868	168	—700

Note: Estimates for indexing based on CBO economic assumptions. Examples assume all earned income.

PRESIDENT REAGAN URGED TO FIND ANOTHER WAY TO COMMEMORATE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF WORLD WAR II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, thank you for scheduling this special order on the President's decision to visit a cemetery in Bitburg, Germany.

As we all know, from having just participated in a debate on a resolution on this very subject, the President's decision to make this cemetery visit has become extremely controversial. It has not only opened the wounds of thousands of Holocaust survivors both in this country and in other parts of the world, it has outraged American veterans throughout the land.

Perhaps most importantly, however, as I tried to indicate in the brief minute that I had on the debate on the resolution just finished, this decision raises serious questions about the competence of this administration to conduct a responsible, viable foreign policy. It has given potential ammunition to the Soviet leadership and to other adversaries to use against this administration and to use against this Nation. It raises serious questions about this administration's judgment and its sense of right and wrong. This decision has opened old wounds at home and abroad and raised serious questions about our leadership not just among our adversaries but among our friends throughout Western Europe. Anybody who watched any of the television shows over the weekend, anybody who opened any of the newspapers in this country, anybody who opened any of the newspapers in Western Europe could simply see by

scanning the headlines that rather than improve our relations with our Western European allies, this decision has done more to raise questions and create strains between the United States and our close friends throughout Western Europe than any decision that has been taken in some time.

In the German military cemetery in Bitburg where the President plans to lay a wreath are the graves of 49 members of the Nazi SS. The SS played a central role in the most hideous atrocities of the Third Reich. James Dickenson, writing in the April 28, 1985, Washington Post described the SS in this fashion:

With their black uniforms, death's head, a symbol of their willingness to die for Adolf Hitler on their caps, and the runic double S flashes on their collars, the SS men were the most fanatical of Hitler's followers and the terror of the entire European Continent. Whatever the actual roles of the young men buried at Bitburg, the SS is one of the most potent symbols of the evil and cruelty in history.

In April 1941, Heinrich Himmler, the head of the SS and the Gestapo, directed that all concentration camp guard units be part of the Waffen SS. At its peak there were 1 million men in the SS. An SS artillery regiment committed the first Nazi military atrocity of the war in the early days of the invasion of Poland when it shot to death some 50 Polish Jews who had been ordered to repair a bridge. Other members of this notorious elite arm of the Nazis were responsible for carrying out the unspeakably barbarous task of exterminating some 6 million Jews, 1 million of whom were children, and some 5 million non-Jewish civilians. Think of it. A total of 11 million men, women, and children murdered at the hands of the Nazi SS. This is a story that every American, every Western European, and most citizens of the world understand and understand quite clearly, and it is a story whose wounds are opened anew by

this very tragic and unfortunate decision.

It was Nazi SS officers who carried out the worst atrocity against American Armed Forces in the European theater in what became known as the Malmédy Massacre. Some 100 American soldiers were murdered in cold blood by the SS at Malmédy. According to former West German Chancellor Willie Brandt, it is well known in Bitburg that the cemetery graves of Nazi SS men include those who massacred U.S. prisoners of war. The President has been urged by Mr. Brandt to reconsider his decision. A majority of both the House and the Senate have asked German Chancellor Helmut Kohl to release President Reagan from his commitment to visit the cemetery, but unfortunately, as of this time, these messages have fallen on deaf ears.

Mr. Speaker, President Reagan's planned visit to Bitburg has rubbed salt in the wounds of thousands of Holocaust survivors who know all too well the unspeakably horrible deeds carried out by the Nazi SS. There is simply no way for them to forget, no way for them to escape the memories of their torment and of their suffering.

We must not forget. The world must not forget. And, unfortunately, the visit to this cemetery suggests that somehow these actions should be placed in some form of relative perspective.

When President Reagan said that the German soldiers of World War II were victims just as surely as the victims of concentration camps, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, either he, or his staff, or some combination have fallen into a terrible trap. It is a trap that can all too often infect the body politic when it is so involved in the efforts to weigh and analyze various forms of decisions, various forms of compromise. Mr. Speaker, there are some

acts, there have been some historical lessons, that are too barbarous, too evil to fall into this form of relativism.

The Nazi SS was just that. New York Times columnist Anthony Lewis has written that the Nazi SS were part of a world of absolute evil. That the President should call them victims reveals a great insensitivity to what the SS and the Nazis were all about.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think the comment made by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], several minutes ago during the course of the debate with regard to the resolution sums up the message that those of us on both sides of the aisle are trying to provide to the President when he is asked to reconsider his trip. That message is that relativism should not have reached the level where we cannot condemn the moral outrages of the Nazi empire and where we should allow those old wounds to be reopened.

Mr. Speaker, we do not believe in collective guilt nor do we impugn the good will of the German people. We are proud of the relationship between the United States and Germany today. It is an important relationship and one that, starting with the Marshall plan, throughout the past 40 years has carefully and appropriately been rebuilt on both sides of the Atlantic. But that does not change the past. It cannot be buried and forgotten with the bodies of those 49 Nazi SS members.

Elie Wiesel, perhaps the most eloquent chronicler and witness to the Holocaust, and perhaps its most well-known survivor today, has implored the President to find another way to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the allied victory of Nazi Germany in World War II. There are so many other appropriate ways in which this reconciliation can be pursued. Out of respect for the memory of those who died and for those who carry their memories and suffering to this day, we respectfully urge the President to heed this call and to find another way.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVINE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

□ 1530

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. First, I would like to commend the gentleman and thank him for requesting this time, this special order, on this most troubling of subjects.

Unfortunately, some of the debate about this subject has been treated as if what we are dealing with is some kind of personal criticism of the President, or the President's attitude on one or another subjects. I think it is most important that we underscore that the debate here is what this Nation stands for and how it expresses, through its top, elected offi-

cial, its President, how it reflects on and states to the world our opinions; our feelings.

Symbols become important in that regard, and as the controversy over the President's ill-advised visit grows, this whole matter takes on that much more significance. For if we fail in our attempt to persuade the President to cancel his visit to Bitburg, we will have been seen as failing to come to grips with this important choice for our country.

That is why it is ever the more important that the President be strong; not weak. It seems to me it is a sign of weakness to go forward with something that so many, that such a broad consensus, the Representatives of this country, have stated to him. Do not go to Bitburg; in doing so, you are not promoting reconciliation, but you are debasing the memory of our own veterans who have fallen. You are suggesting that somehow those fallen in combat suffered the same fate as the Holocaust victims who the Nazis sought to exterminate.

This is the time for the strength of a leader who says, I understand my country; I understand that if I have taken a step, which I believe the President has, to do something that does not properly promote future reconciliation, but the risk that we will not have learned the lessons of the Holocaust, or the lessons of the Nazis, it is so important that the President use his leadership skills at this time to change direction. I think he will be commended by all Americans when he does so. The healing that is needed is needed here on this issue at this time.

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentleman for his extremely important and perceptive remarks.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

Mr. FROST. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today to express my fervent hope that the President will change his mind and cancel his participation in a memorial ceremony at the Bitburg Cemetery. A cemetery which houses the graves of some of Hitler's infamous SS guard—his concentration camp executioners, and slaughterers of American POW's. Mr. President, this visit is an insult to the survivors of the Nazi Holocaust, to the American soldiers who fought to rid the world of the Nazi plague, and to the memories of all those who perished in the death camps and on the battlefields.

I don't need to recount the atrocities committed by Hitler and the SS. We have all seen pictures of the infamous death camps and been moved by the testimony of those few who survived the horror. We know that the crimes committed there were crimes not just against Jews, but against humanity.

And we recognize that those crimes were the most heinous in the history of mankind. For the President of the United States, the leader of the free world, to appear to sanction those crimes in any way is unconscionable.

Many have said during this debate that the time has come to forgive and forget. Certainly, we bear no ill will toward the people of Germany today—they have been our friends and allies for many, many years.

But how can we forget? How can we forget when at every Holocaust memorial ceremony there are dozens of men and women who still wear the numbers that were burned into their arms, and still bear even deeper scars internally? How can we forget the murder of 6 million Jews? How can we forget the torture and the gas chambers?

We cannot forget, and we must not. For many Americans whose lives were touched by the Nazi atrocities, this is an intensely personal wound that will not heal. They believe, as I do, that to forget debases the memory of those who suffered and died.

More importantly, they understand that to forget would be dangerous. Our sense of history and our sense of decency are the only assurances we have that this senseless tragedy will never be repeated. To honor the Nazis, Mr. President, is an affront to both.

I applaud your moves toward reconciliation, but caution you that we must not pay too high a price. We must not sacrifice our remembrance. You have spoken often of the great good and collective wisdom of the American people and the people have spoken clearly on this matter. This Nation looks to you for moral leadership. I ask that you display the courage needed to provide that leadership. Admit that a terrible mistake has been made, accept responsibility for that mistake, and cancel your visit to the cemetery. Whatever the consequences of that action might be, you must remember that this is a moral, not a political question.

Again, Mr. President, I urge you to heed the words of Elie Wiesel who spoke for so many of us when he implored you to "find another way."

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his very insightful remarks.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BURTON].

Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, for me, this is particularly a very difficult moment. If I did not come to this country before Hitler invaded Poland, I would not be standing here and talking.

I cannot understand, for the life of me, why the President is going to pay homage to those people in the cemetery, the Waffen SS people, which were the worst of the lot. The worst. That he is going to pay homage at the

cemetery in Bitburg. It is difficult for me to speak, because I will really break out crying.

Mr. Speaker, you are looking at a woman who does not have an uncle or an aunt or a cousin left. They all perished either in Auschwitz or Treblinka. The President of the United States, our President, is going to pay homage to the SS people buried in Bitburg. I cannot understand it. I cannot understand it; it troubles me; it bothers me.

I know that Mr. Reagan is not a bad man; I know he served in the Second World War. I myself saw him in uniform once in California. I know that he does not mean to do any harm to our people, whether they are Jews or non-Jews. I think it is just a misguided thing that happened to him. He was misguided by the people who went out there to see where the President is going to lay a wreath.

Now, we can have reconciliation with the German people; with the West German people. We have had it for the last—what is it—30, 40 years? We have had it, and I think that the United States has been a great friend to the Germans, who, after this terrible Holocaust, did not have anything. They were bombed out; they did not have any money; they were starving. Who came in to help? The Americans. The Americans built up the German economy.

To say that we need this deed to have a reconciliation with the West German people, that is really untrue, unfair, and unjust. Be just, my heart really cries out to the President. Do not do this thing, Mr. President. Be strong; be just; be fair; please, Mr. President, do not go to Bitburg, please.

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentlewoman for her very eloquent remarks.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to all of those who feel that deep hurt of severe wounds from the worst inhumanity of man to man ever perpetrated on this planet; that the symbolism has so built up that now some people think the President is actually paying homage to SS killers.

I have tracked this very closely; I have called the White House over 2 weeks ago when this thing first broke, to implore them to take fast, corrective action. I think the blame will, in the end, be on those who are leaving White House service at the end of this month; actually they should have left on the 15th of this month. I think that if there is no turning the agenda around; if Chancellor Kohl, for some reason unknown to me is not moved by a unanimous voice vote of the U.S. Senate and a letter from 245 of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, if

that does not move him, then he has some deep-felt reason himself that somehow or other 40 years of reconciliation has come down to this point on the head of a needle.

□ 1540

I do not understand it. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not understand it. However, I would say that all of this focus that is so negative at this point is released by the world hearing carefully what the President says when he visits Bergen-Belsen, that the world listens far more closely than it would have otherwise to what the President says when he visits this cemetery, and I am still hoping against hope that he will not, but I think the President then has an opportunity to take these moments in the brilliant sunlight to heal the wounds of that war a little bit more.

If the world feels, through the heart and the mind and the emotion of the President of the United States, the horror once again of the Holocaust, then some good will have come out of this. I think it is significant that the German Congress, their Bundestag, has already made it illegal to say in Germany that the Holocaust did not happen, that that alone is something significant to come out of Germany. It is something that we would never allow in this country. Our civil rights allow people to say the most outrageous and obnoxious things up and almost including yelling, "Fire" in a theater, so we have to acknowledge that this is something that could never be passed in this Congress, but there are opportunities, if they are handled correctly, to make something good come out of all the hurt here.

I know that when I went with the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] to the Holocaust ceremony in our rotunda a few weeks ago that the high moment, when I saw most of the people crying, was when the American flags came into the room, not that we needed an American identification. What brought me to tears was the thought that those flags arrived too late, particularly at Bergen-Belsen. Twenty thousand people died in March because we could not figure out how to win that war sooner than we did. Another 7,000 or 8,000 died in the first 2 weeks of April, and 9,000 died within 2 weeks of being liberated, their only solace being that they died free men and women and children, although their bodies were so emaciated they could never know the fruits of freedom beyond a few days. Another 4,000 died in May. Almost 85 percent of the total of the 50,000 people who died in Bergen-Belsen died in the last few weeks of the war and the few weeks to come.

I am sure the President will be apprised of all of that, and I am just trusting, if I cannot trust on the good

judgment of people in the White House who set this up, I am trusting my President, I am trusting his heart, the compliments that Mrs. BURTON just paid him of how far back his support goes for all the survivors of the Holocaust, that he will take this hurt that so many people are feeling and turn it into a shining moment in the Sun when he will make the world again remember the horror so it can never happen again.

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentleman for participating in this special order and for his thoughtful comments. I do appreciate his, and so many colleagues of his on the other side of the aisle, having participated in this bipartisan effort to encourage the President to reconsider his unfortunate decision.

The one area in which I have some disagreement with the specific comments of the gentleman is that I find it extremely difficult to understand, particularly in light of the unfortunate, complicating comments that have already been made in terms of comparing some of the people who were buried at the cemetery with some of the victims of the concentration camps. I find it very difficult to see how these words can heal and how this issue can be placed on the footing that I understand the gentleman would like to see it placed on by any action short of actually deciding not to visit the specific cemetery at issue. There are so many other places in Germany which would be appropriate focuses for healing, for reconciliation, and for a symbolic statement. But I do very much appreciate the thoughtful and helpful comments of the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my personal appreciation to the gentleman for taking out this special order.

As you say, there may be a silver lining in the President's trip, but I think no matter what is said by him that there will be more threads of misunderstanding and of misperception. Over the weekend, like everybody else, I read and I listened intently to the various comments from both sides of the Atlantic on the trip to Germany by the President, and I heard it urged in various ways in defense of his trip, especially to the cemetery, that it is time to focus on the future and not on the past, and that the West Germans feel that the protest against the visit represents an effort to impose collective guilt on the German people.

Let me express my feeling, and that is that some important distinctions are being blurred or forgotten altogether

by those who defend in that way or any way the President's decision. One distinction is between collective guilt and community responsibility. If what is meant by collective guilt is that all in Germany by citizenship alone bear a common guilt, I do not believe in that concept at all.

But there is a real difference between collective guilt and community responsibility. I do believe in community responsibility if by that is meant that a society collectively must acknowledge the evils that grew within that society and their debt to its victims. Nazism, after all, did grow within a particular society, with millions participating, with millions of others acquiescing, and with millions losing their lives as a result. It was not imposed Nazism by an invading army from another land.

A second distinction is between compliance with orders and exertion of individual will. We did not punish every individual within German society, whether members of the general public or rank and file military personnel for compliance with orders of their national government. But at the same time, it is not necessary that those nations who fought Germany pay equal honor to the vast majority who complied with the national orders and to the minority within Germany who bravely pursued against the Nazis their own individual conscience, often to their death at the hands of their own countrymen.

A third distinction that is important is the proper one between facing the future and forgetting the past. There is no contradiction necessarily between the two and, indeed, in this case there is an absolute congruity because unless we do in fact weep over the incalculable spilling of innocent blood, the future can go dangerously awry.

I thank the gentleman from California very much for giving me this opportunity to speak.

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BURTON of California). The gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] has 33 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the Chair.

I would be pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. I will not take much time.

Madam Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman in his special order today, asking the President to cancel his planned trip to Bitburg, the situs of the burial ground for some of the SS officers, formerly associated with the Nazi Party in Germany.

I had occasion a few years ago to travel to Israel and to visit the Holocaust Museum in Jerusalem with my little daughter who had never witnessed some of the film that she saw there, some of the horrible, grotesque atrocities pictured there that were inflicted upon human beings. She was horrified, as I was reminded of the horrors of the Nazis which were inflicted upon the Jewish people in World War II.

I felt, when the flak occurred announcing the President's visit to the cemetery, that it was a very insensitive act on the part of any official of the U.S. Government, much less the President of our great country, to bestow the honor of visiting a cemetery where these monsters are buried. The only good that I can think that could possibly come of this visit is that it may possibly heighten the visibility of the atrocities of World War II so that little children who were not born during that era may be reminded of the indelible horrors that occurred before their birth so they might learn of these terrible inhumanities to man.

As I was made aware of the fact that 40 percent of the American people were revealed in a poll today as not knowing which side the United States fought on during the Vietnam War, it is possible that some value may occur from the President's visit to this cemetery and his presence there will give those of us who are sensitive to those atrocities a forum to mind others that civilized humanity shall never allow those atrocities to occur again.

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and congratulate him for reserving time for this very important special order.

Madam Speaker, let me say that this trip of the President's has pained me greatly. One cannot understand why the President is actually going. One hears so many different explanations, but none of them make any sense. None of them have refuted the idea of going to a different place where the SS is not buried, where one could honor the many millions of Germans who were not part of Nazism—those who suffered on the home front and those who suffered in the war as so many other people did. Yet, through the din and noise and everything else that has emanated from the White House recently, we have not heard a single reason why Bitburg is a better place to visit than the grave of Konrad Adenauer, or of Pastor Neimoller, the great German theologian, or of the resistance fighters—the many thousands and hundreds of thousands of Germans who resisted quietly and with arms, with voices, with thoughts, and

with hearts. Or the President could honor a symbol of the new Germany, the generation that was born after the war.

Mr. President, do not go to Bitburg. By insisting on visiting Bitburg, Mr. President, you are saying that there is not another site in Germany that is untainted. We have heard not from the President but from some of his advisers that Helmut Kohl has asked him to visit. Helmut Kohl is an ally of the President's, as West Germany is an ally of the United States, an ally that we need and deeply appreciate. But there are times in diplomacy and politics when a friend comes to you and says, "Please do me this favor," and you say to that friend, "I would do almost anything you ask, but I must draw the line. I cannot do this. Let me do the favor in another way, at another time, in another place."

Morality does enter into politics every so often. There has never been a more appropriate time that morality should enter into politics than today. I find it somewhat ironic that Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger, the prime practitioners of real politics, hard-nosed, brassstacks politics, are being cited as a reason, as a bolster, for the President going to Bitburg when it is not the type of diplomacy that they practiced, necessary as it often is, that is needed now.

Mr. President, I know you do not intend this, but you are sending a signal. You are sending a signal to thousands of people in Germany and France and England and Italy, and yes, in this country and in many other countries, to the small minority who are fanatics, who are neo-Nazis. You are sending a signal to them that their hatred is OK. You are not saying that it is OK, but in their warped minds, when you visit that cemetery, they will believe it is OK. And lest you think, Mr. President, that this hatred is insignificant and far away, let me read to you some lines from the very popular German magazine, *Quick*. The lines, quoted in the *New York Times*, are from an article entitled, "Reagan visit in Germany: The Power of the Jews," and it reads, talking about Jewish Americans:

Their protests were accompanied by a gigantic press campaign in which not only Jewish commentators recalled the suffering of Europe's Jews under the Nazis. The major television networks broadcast anti-German films; theaters put dramas of Jewish suffering in their programs.

The article referred to "the powerful influence of Jewish Cabinet ministers such as Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, surrounding Reagan." Caspar Weinberger happens to be a practicing Episcopalian.

Quick also asserted, that "the Jewish lobby dominates U.S. commercial television networks and many newspapers."

Mr. President, is this any more evidence than you need? Do not give a signal, an unintended signal but a real signal. Do not go to Bitburg. Choose another site. There are many people in my district, tens of thousands, who are Holocaust survivors. When you walk down a shopping street in my district in the summer, when people are wearing short sleeves, you can see tattooed numbers on people's arms. These people want reconciliation with Germany, too. But they do not want it at the graves of the SS. Nor do American veterans want reconciliation at the graves of the SS.

A man came to me in my district just yesterday and he told me that he and his family have lived in this country for a long time. A cousin of his was one of the American prisoners captured by the Germans at the Battle of the Bulge and massacred by the Waffen SS at Malmedy. American POW's with their hands up in the air, walking along being brutally machine gunned.

The tragedy of Nazism is not limited to any one group. The horror, the blackness, the emptiness of Nazism is not limited, and it must never be forgotten. We cannot wash it over. We should build a foundation between West Germany and ourselves, but not at the gravesite of the SS, because reconciliations such as that can never be.

Mr. President, all of us who have spoken here on this special order, and many, many millions of Americans and people of the world are asking you, please do not visit Bitburg.

□ 1600

Mr. LEVINE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his extremely thoughtful and important remarks.

I am now very pleased to yield to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Nevada [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID. Madam Speaker, I had the good fortune this morning of attending a burial at Arlington National Cemetery. I participated in this gravesite service honoring my friend from Nevada, J. Lyn Smith, a paratrooper in the Second World War. This is a great contrast to the proposed trip to a German cemetery of our President.

Madam Speaker, I do not think any reasonable person can assert that the President's decision to go to Bitburg during his trip to West Germany next month was provoked by any mean spirit within him, or by irreverence to the memory of American and allied veterans of World War II. Apparently the President was asked to make this visit by a tearful Chancellor Kohl. When he accepted, the President did not know there were SS soldiers buried there. Now he knows.

If he does not alter his plans, he risks searing the sensibilities not only of survivors of the Holocaust, but of

any one who can identify with the victims of Nazi Germany's hateful edict. Clearly, this encompasses a lot of people. Both the House and the Senate have directed letters to the President exhorting him to reconsider the Bitburg component of his trip. Large elements of the American public have urged better judgment. And some of our allies have expressed their reservations over this decision, as well.

As if this weren't enough to compel a change, surely, too, the Soviets will have a field day with this fodder for anti-American propaganda. Why bring this upon ourselves?

President Reagan misdiagnoses where the test of his integrity lies in this whole dilemma. He won't be accused of lacking integrity for recanting what is a bad decision. Instead he stands to lose far more by clinging to this mistake, having to lay a wreath and make a speech at Bitburg—where 47 SS soldiers are buried—and then confront a tide of negative repercussions.

Because the only major player that Reagan would need to mollify if he chooses another cemetery is Kohl, certainly this ill-advised decision can be turned around. There is still time for the President to reschedule his itinerary. I implore him to do so.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. REID], and I am now pleased to yield to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for taking out this special order to try and get across the fundamental point that we are seeking to make.

I do not know anyone in the House nor anyone in Washington to whom I have spoken who objects to firm, friendly, solid relations between America and West Germany. What we object to is the notion that you have to include a visit to a cemetery where there are Nazi soldiers, particularly the SS, as a means of doing that.

The West Germans have a great deal of which to be proud. Out of that terrible event of the Nazi regime, for which German society was responsible, they have come to the situation where today West Germany stands out as a respected, democratic nation. Indeed their East German brothers and sisters have to be physically restrained from coming to this new, prosperous, democratic nation of West Germany.

It is important that we honor that accomplishment, but not by denying what went before. In fact, it is a measure of the accomplishment when we realize what went before, and there is no inconsistency at all between a recognition of what West Germany has accomplished today and a continued decision that there can be no forget-

ting, no reconciliation, and no relaxation of what has to be a universal human hatred of the Hitler regime. There is no inconsistency there.

In fact, we are not talking now simply about bad public relations on the part of the President. We are talking about a misperception that says there has to be some honor and some fealty paid to the people who fought for and defended the Nazi regime as a means of forging and continuing to have our close links with West Germany.

Yes; I understand the West German Government has asked President Reagan to do this. They are mistaken, and there cannot be a serious argument, after all that has transpired between our own Nation and West Germany since 1945, from the Marshall plan on to the current very heavy stationing of American troops there.

Through good, economic relations, through all that we have been through together, it is inconceivable that anyone can argue that this visit to the cemetery is necessary. It is a very grave error that the President made. He has consistently compounded the error time and again by his statements and by his explanations. It is not too late. You do not show weakness by admitting when you made a mistake. The weakness is in persisting in this mistake and in compounding it as the President has done.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], and I am very pleased to yield now to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Madam Speaker, I share the concern expressed by so many Members of this House about the President's planned trip to the German military cemetery in Bitburg, West Germany. The ceremony is an affront to the memory of all who died at the hands of Hitler's legions and to all those who sacrificed to ensure that freedom would endure in Western Europe.

Surely, it is inappropriate for an American head of state, representing the people who liberated Germany and Western Europe from the greatest horrors in the history of humankind, to participate in a ceremony of remembrance for those who fought to extend the terrors of nazism during the Second World War. I cannot at all understand how this terrible ceremony was ever contemplated to be appropriate; nor can I imagine why Chancellor Kohl and President Reagan insist on going through with it.

I fully share the President's goal of increasing reconciliation between the German and the American people. Yet, the placement of a wreath at a

military cemetery containing SS graves undermines that goal considerably. The American and German people have come together in the postwar years because of our shared commitment to the enduring values of peace, freedom, and democracy. Since the defeat of nazism in Europe, the people of West Germany and of West Berlin have dedicated and demonstrated their commitment to those values.

Rather than commemorate the deaths of many who died opposing those values, might it not be more appropriate to commemorate the lives of those who fought for freedom and a progressive future in postwar Germany? I wrote to President Reagan 2 weeks ago suggesting that the cemetery ceremony be replaced with one at the grave of Konrad Adenauer, the German Chancellor whose courage and leadership did so much to restore the trust and faith that Americans and Germans feel for one another. Instead, the President has decided to go ahead with his visit to Bitburg, while adding a ceremony at Bergen-Belsen.

The tragic initial decision to go to Bitburg is only exacerbated by the insensitivities expressed by those who believe that a trip to the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp can in some way add balance. How can anyone believe that a wreath-laying ceremony in a cemetery containing Nazi Waffen SS could be balanced by another event? The only appropriate action must be a cancellation of the Bitburg ceremony.

Over 2,400 years ago, Sophocles, in "Antigone," wrote an eternal truth that President Reagan and Chancellor Kohl would be well to remember. "All men make mistakes," he wrote, "but the just man admits his error and repairs the pain he has caused. The only sin is pride."

It would be a tragic error if the President's insistence on visiting the Bitburg ceremony undermined the spirit of reconciliation that has existed between our two countries for some time. Since the late 1940's, when Americans came to aid of West Berliners during their hour of need—during the Berlin blockade—Germans have known that the American people supported their freedom and were willing to take risks to preserve and defend it. Our efforts under the Marshall plan helped to forge a growing and vibrant economy there, and our work in NATO has ensured that all West Germans have had the chance to live in peace and freedom.

Madam Speaker, the President's trip to West Germany should not be used to gloss over the tragedies in the past or to rewrite history. I believe it should commemorate America's participation in the conquering of Hitler, the ending of the Holocaust, and the liberation of Western Europe from the grip of Nazi rule. I commend my col-

leagues for calling this special order. Chancellor Kohl and German people must understand how sincerely we oppose the Bitburg ceremony and the presence of President Reagan in a Nazi graveyard. I urge them to change their plans and work to arrange an event that will appropriately celebrate our two countries' continuing efforts to maintain the peace and freedom of Western Europe.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his remarks.

I am very pleased now to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] for making this time available to us to discuss this important issue and to reiterate my own deep concerns about the President's proposed visit to the Bitburg Cemetery in Germany.

In the past few days a great deal of discussion has focussed on the decision process involved in this matter, as well as the options available to the President to alter this decision. In today's Washington Post, mention was made that the President now plans to visit the Bitburg Cemetery for only a very brief time, while arranging a much more lengthy visit to the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp. It is obvious that many people are working to encourage the President to change his mind about visiting Bitburg, and I again reiterate my own suggestion that a more appropriate site of reconciliation would be to lay a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Germany.

The events of the last few weeks have caused a great deal of personal anguish to many of my own constituents. My 22d Congressional District in New York has a high percentage of veterans of World War II, as well as concentration camp survivors. I have received more personal pleas and outcries from them in less time than I have on any other issue. Some of those veterans had families who perished in the camps, so that the Americans were not just fighting for freedom and democracy but the very lives of their own brethren. This intense, personal dedication deserves a noble response on our part, and on the part of our President. Elie Wiesel and others have responded to this crisis of anguish most eloquently, and all have spoken from the heart. Their appeal is not political, it is humanitarian. As Americans, we cannot in good conscience honor those who dedicated themselves to the singleminded act of genocide. It does not matter that many of these soldiers were young men; the SS was a voluntary branch of the Nazi regime, with a 2-year strict training program. Sworn enemies of the Jews, these SS soldiers fulfilled

Hitler's orders to make Europe judenrein—empty of Jews. These same SS soldiers perpetrated a monstrous massacre of our own Allied troops, without any regard to the moral implications of their barbaric actions.

Madam Speaker, I join with my colleagues in appealing to our President to reconsider his visit to the Bitburg Cemetery as an improper setting for his commemorative wreath-laying ceremony.

□ 1610

Mr. LEVINE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Madam Speaker, I guess one of the most difficult things in politics is to say simply, "Look, I goofed."

The White House has clearly made an error in judgment in deciding that it is appropriate for the President of the United States to visit the Bitburg Cemetery. There are numerous reasons that should compel the White House to change its mind if it were not so hard in public life to say a mistake was made. This visit is an affront to the victims of the Holocaust; an affront to the soldiers who fought nazism, and a very serious mistake in foreign policy.

The young men who fought together in World War II from the United States and the Soviet Union met at the Elbe River. They recently commemorated an anniversary of that time when they marched together in opposition to the spreading terror of nazism.

For an American President now to go to a cemetery to honor those in the cemetery, including Nazi SS troops buried there, would give the Soviets an enormous propaganda coup. What they would do, you can imagine for the next year, 5 years, or 10 years, is send pictures all around the world about an American President visiting a cemetery paying honor to dead Nazi war SS troops.

This is an incredible foreign policy mistake. All of us need to be prepared to say, "Yes, on second thought, it's the wrong thing to do."

The President made a commitment. The President said, "Yes, I'll do that." But on reflection, it is not a good idea. It is not a good idea for him. It is not a good idea for this country.

So I think, along with my distinguished colleague from California and others who had made the case very eloquently, it is time for the President and the White House to say, "Yes, we blew this one. What we are proposing to do doesn't make sense and, yes, we are going to change our minds because changing your mind when you are pro-

posing to do something wrong is the right thing to do."

It is the right thing for the President. I hope the President changes his mind.

I thank the gentleman for taking this special order.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

In closing, let me thank all of those who have participated in this special order on both sides of the aisle, and all those who participated just before this special order in the presentation of the very important resolution that has strong, bipartisan support urging the President to reconsider his trip.

Let me thank all of those who constitute a clear majority of both this House on a bipartisan basis and the other body on a bipartisan basis who have urged Chancellor Kohl to reconsider his invitation to our President with regard to this ill-conceived plan.

Let me in terms of recapturing some of what was said by so many people, again on both sides of the aisle, summarize simply by saying that this is not designed to be a political issue. This is an issue where Democrats and Republicans together have joined in a very respectful fashion to urge the President of the United States to reconsider an ill-conceived decision.

This, I might say on a personal note, is the first special order that I have ever taken out in my two terms in the House. I believe that this time should be reserved for issues on which one feels very deeply and in which there are very important concerns at stake.

I think we have seen from the people who have spoken here today how deeply people do feel on this issue. This is an issue on which people are speaking from the heart. You do not see people reading elaborate speeches from notes. You do not see people using lines that have been given to them by their staffs. This is an issue which is extremely clear on a variety of levels, on a moral level, on a foreign policy level, on a diplomatic level, and on all the levels that have been discussed here today. It is one that has beckoned forth deep sentiment from throughout this entire country and from citizens who are very good and close friends of our country from around the globe.

In the name of everything that is good in America and in the name of everything that we have stood for as a nation since the days of the Revolution and particularly in the name of reconciliation and healing with the people of Germany, on behalf of the Republicans and the Democrats who have spoken today, and on other days on the floor of this House, and in the other body, and so many citizens from around the globe, I earnestly hope and sincerely urge the President to reconsider this very unfortunate decision.

● Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, the President's persistent and wrong-headed determination to visit a West German military cemetery at Bitburg that contains the graves of at least 47 Waffen SS members, while canceling a similar visit to the original "model" Nazi concentration camp at Dachau, will leave a scar of shame on the national memory for generations to come.

This decision is a deliberate affront to all people of conscience, regardless of national origin, ethnic or religious background, because it honors the victimizers at the expense of their victims. The SS in all its perverse manifestations were the ultimate subversion of the Judeo-Christian ideals that have been the very foundation of Western civilization.

The SS were the implementers of Hitler's "final solution" who were directly responsible for the genocide of almost 6 million Jews. They were the mass murderers who exterminated equal numbers of non-Jews in the concentration camps because of their opposition to, or lack of suitability for inclusion in the criminal madness that was the Third Reich.

It was the Waffen SS that initiated a series of deliberate World War II atrocities, beginning in Poland in 1939, and continuing with the murder of 101 British prisoners of war at Le Paradis in 1940 to the wanton massacre of at least 71 uniformed U.S. military personnel at Malmédy, Belgium, in 1944. Some of the members from the SS unit that conducted the Malmédy massacre are buried in the cemetery at Bitburg.

What must the surviving American veterans of the Battle of the Bulge who helped to liberate Germany from the Nazi horrors think of a President who chooses to honor these murders while ignoring them?

What must the veterans of other Allied nations whose comrades were also massacred by the SS in virtually every country of Europe think of this decision which is historically ignorant and personally insensitive?

What must those Germans who resisted Hitler and Nazism think when Wehrmacht military and Waffen SS are publicly remembered—and implicitly honored—while their incredible courage is deliberately ignored—all in the name of "reconciliation"? What a tragic revision of recent history! What an incredible inversion of moral imperatives. ***

At the same time the President is visiting the cemetery at Bitburg the SS will be having a public reunion in Bavaria, not far from the site of Dachau. The President is also scheduled to meet with Franz Joseph Strauss, the West German political leader in Bavaria who first urged the President not to visit Dachau because

he feared "leftist, anti-American" protests.

How sad—and how shallow a series of excuses by the leaders of both countries. I urge the President to rescind his personal decision to visit the military cemetery at Bitburg and to focus his full attention on honoring the victims of Nazism, not its perpetrators. To do any less in our name is to dishonor us all. ●

● Mr. RODINO. Madam Speaker, some have called the President's decision to go to the Bitburg Cemetery a political error, a public relations gaffe. Others have called it a diplomatic mistake, particularly with the damage it appears to have done to our relations with our West German allies. But his decision is much more than a political or diplomatic mistake. It is a moral dagger that pierces the heart of so many Americans and Europeans who suffered under the iron fist of nazism. And it is a psychological assault on the Holocaust survivors—and on the relatives on the many who didn't survive—who must live with a memory haunted by the evil, grim specter of the Nazi final solution.

Imagine the inner tears of the survivors who heard the President say that the German World War II soldiers "were victims, just as surely as the victims in the concentration camps." Imagine the inner anguish of the survivors who heard the President decline a visit to Dachau, then agree to visit Bitburg, and then, after the press revealed that the cemetery contained the graves of the SS troopers, decided to visit Bergen Belsen to balance out his visits. We cannot balance out good and evil. If everyone is a victim, then no one is a victim.

Madam Speaker, I am concerned about reports that the President's advisers counseled him not to "cave in" on this decision. But who is he caving into, Holocaust survivors? American veterans?

For 40 years the American and German people have developed close ties because of a common faith in democracy. Our alliance is strong, and our shared goals are noble. Reconciliation between our two nations is a fact. A ceremony at Bitburg is unnecessary. There are many other ways to remember—a visit at the grave of Konrad Adenauer, a commemoration of the German resistance, a recognition of the allied dead. But why Bitburg? Why the pain for the survivors and the Allied veterans? Why tread on history?

Madam Speaker, allow me to quote from the moving remarks of Elie Wiesel:

I, too, wish to attain true reconciliation with the German people. I do not believe in collective guilt, nor in collective responsibility. Only the killers were guilty. Their sons and daughters are not. And I believe *** that we can and we must work together

with them and with all people. And we must work to bring peace and understanding to a tormented world that . . . is still awaiting redemption.

Madam Speaker, Bitburg is not the door to redemption. I implore the President: for the sake of history, and for the sake of the living, please don't go. ●

● Mr. WEISS. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge the President to cancel his plans to visit the Bitburg Cemetery, where, in addition to German soldiers, he will be honoring Waffen SS members, who conducted the Nazi genocide against the Jewish people.

Mr. Reagan's trip to Germany—his belated addition of a visit to a concentration camp, and his refusal to cancel a stop at Bitburg—reflects a moral and historical blindness to the suffering of the victims of Hitler's Germany. No dramatic speech by the President or public relations extravaganza by his advancement can heal the wounds opened by President Reagan's insensitivity.

Scheduling for the trip has been blighted by moral obtuseness and misjudgment. In February the President first indicated he would not visit a German concentration camp site, saying he wanted to avoid opening old wounds while in Germany. Then, he added the stop at the Bitburg Military Cemetery. On April 18, he justified this visit by explaining that German soldiers who died defending nazism were "just as surely" victims as the 6 million Jews and millions of other nationalities tortured and slaughtered in Hitler's gas chambers.

President Reagan now stubbornly refuses to admit he made a mistake. After a direct plea not to visit Bitburg from the Chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council and Buchenwald survivor, Elie Wiesel, the President still resists altering his plans. Simon Wisenthal, a Holocaust survivor who searches for Nazi war criminals still at large, denounced the Bitburg stopover while declining the President's invitation to Bitburg. The U.S. Senate urged the President to reassess his plans. And last week, 257 Members of this body wrote Chancellor Helmut Kohl asking him to withdraw his invitation to Reagan to lay a wreath at Bitburg.

Even with the added trip to Bergen-Belsen, the Bitburg visit is morally wrong. It prevents us from paying proper tribute to the victims of nazism and the Americans who fought that evil. It is an improper way to pay tribute to the free and democratic Federal Republic of Germany. And, it is an improper way to pay tribute to heroic Germans that resisted Hitler's efforts in World War II.

The President is now scrambling to find a politically acceptable way to visit Bitburg when there is no such alternative except not to visit the ceme-

tery. Some assert that it would be a sign of weakness for the President to cancel his visit. On the contrary, this is an opportunity for the President to present a lesson about the Holocaust for current and future generations. If the President cancels his Bitburg visit, the lesson will be an unambiguous one, and all the more powerful. It would certainly be a demonstration of personal, as well as our Nation's, resolve about human rights and freedom. This is a strong message, not a weak one.

"The issue here is not politics," said Elie Wiesel, "but good and evil." Unfortunately, the President fails to see the difference even when presented so plainly. Madam Speaker, the American people can distinguish between right and wrong.

I, too, believe that our friends in the Federal Republic of Germany should not collectively suffer guilt for the Nazi crimes, and on this 40th anniversary of V-E day we should celebrate our friendship. However, I am afraid to think of what that day will symbolize to the world when the President of the United States lays a wreath at the graves of SS troops. I urge the President to cancel his trip to the Bitburg Cemetery. ●

● Mr. EDGAR. Madam Speaker, my colleagues, I'm sorry that we all have to be here today. To you, to me, to most Americans, it's obvious that the President should not lay a wreath before the graves of the SS at Bitburg. But today, after weeks of controversy, we're here making a last desperate plea for President Reagan not to reopen the wounds of World War II.

I share the President's desire to achieve reconciliation. However, the Bitburg ceremony is guaranteed to be divisive, not unifying. It is guaranteed to be a hurtful act, not an act of healing.

I believe Elie Wiesel said it best when he accepted his medal at the White House 11 days ago. He said:

I too wish to attain true reconciliation with the German people. I do not believe in collective guilt, nor in collective responsibility. . . . we can and must work together with them and with all people. And we must work to bring peace and understanding to a tormented world that, as you know, is still awaiting redemption . . .

The issue, as Mr. Wiesel said, is not one of politics, but one of good and evil. The President should not be attempting to heal by honoring the graves of SS soldiers, Hitler's elite corps who ran the death camps and participated in the massacre of American prisoners of war. A ceremony recognizing even one individual who participated in the Nazi war crimes denigrates the purpose of the President's trip and works against reconciliation.

There is still time for the President to change his plans, to honor the grave of a German member of the resistance, or Chancellor Adenauer, who did so much for postwar reconciliation.

There is still time for the President to change his plans, to contribute to the healing of wounds.

Let me close on a personal note. Veterans and members of the Jewish community have been vocal in their opposition to the President's trip; some have even said that this is a "Jewish issue" or a "veterans issue."

Jews and veterans should not be alone; I submit that this is an issue for all Americans. As a Methodist minister, I believe that all of us—Christians and Jews, Republicans and Democrats, men and women—should speak out to insist that good triumphs, that healing triumphs. Working together, we can pursue and achieve justice. ●

● Mr. YATES. Madam Speaker, I participate in this special order today with a sense of fundamental sadness that is rooted in disappointment and disbelief. When I spoke to the House on April 15 about the serious mistake that the President was making with the scheduled visit to the Bitburg Cemetery, I, like many others, believed that the President would recognize this and the cemetery would be dropped from his itinerary.

This has not happened. A bad situation has become much worse and there is now a very troubling, Kafka-like quality to the whole event. It is as though the ability to alter the trip was beyond the reach or power of mortal man. But it is not too late, and the President should listen to reason.

Those SS graves in Bitburg are symbolic. They represent the darkest chapter in modern world history. To go to that cemetery with the wreath, the flags, and all implications that the visit carries with it is a mistake of tremendous proportions for this country, Germany, and the West as a whole. There can be no reconciliation with the SS. As Elie Wiesel said to the President: "That place, Mr. President, is not your place. Your place is with the victims of the SS." ●

● Mr. DASCHLE. Madam Speaker, even though President Reagan is leaving on his European trip tomorrow, there is still time for him to cancel his visit to Germany's military cemetery at Bitburg.

And he must cancel the event.

The President of the United States should salute today's Germany—the Germany that is a model of Democracy, not honor a dark moment in human history when thousands upon thousands of Jewish men, women, and children were murdered simply because of their heritage.

The President of the United States should pay tribute to 40 years of peace between the United States and Germany, not honor German soldiers who were responsible for tens of thousands of American casualties.

The President of the United States should visit a cemetery where Allied

forces are buried, not a cemetery that was once used as a staging area for the bloody Battle of the Bulge where more than 70,000 American GIs were killed.

The President of the United States should pay his respects to the victims of the Holocaust and its survivors, not lay a wreath at the gravesites of those who guarded the death camps from escape and outside interference.

The visit to Bitburg is a terrible mistake. It reopens old wounds. It is an insensitive decision that minimizes the sacrifices of American veterans and the suffering of Jews who were declared enemies of the state. It drives a wedge between the United States and Germany. And it goes against all that this Nation stands for, and has fought for, in its 200-year history.●

● Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, the President's scheduled trip to the Bitburg Cemetery has caused a great deal of furor both among his supporters and those who do not always agree with him.

Why is there so much controversy over this visit? Why is a symbolic trip to a cemetery so important? Because symbolism is all the victims of the Holocaust have left. It is the only solace they can find from the horror they experienced. We cannot adequately imagine that horror; we can only pay respect through our remembrance.

The words "never again" ring loudly from the survivors and the families of the survivors of the Holocaust. But to make certain that those words have meaning, it is up to us to join with them in their efforts to keep the memory of this tragedy alive.

I think it is important that when we ask the President not to go to Bitburg we do so not as Democrats and Republicans, but as Americans who do not want our Nation to be in any way connected with the evil of the SS. The memory of the excesses of that evil must be preserved so that we can forever guard against this dark side of humanity. The President must not go to Bitburg and betray the vigilance of this memory.●

● Mr. McGRATH. Madam Speaker, the message is clear. The American people are distraught over the memories that the President's proposed trip reawakens. Please have come from all segments of our society imploring the President not to visit Bitburg's military cemetery.

I have never received such impassioned mail as that which this controversy has evoked. This outpouring reaffirms my belief that the President must find another way to signal our sincere reconciliation toward the democratic government that rose from the ashes of Nazi Germany 40 years ago.

I have heard from veterans, Holocaust survivors, and many people who do not fall into either category. I would like to share with you the senti-

ments they have expressed which highlight the height of the despair and confusion they feel.

I'm a veteran of World War II who lost many dear friends fighting for our country. . . . In decorating and honoring the graves of ex-Nazis we are doing a disservice to the cherished memories and the ideals of our American war dead.—Mr. Benjamin Feldman, 5th District, New York.

As a refugee from Nazi Germany who lost his parents and innumerable dear ones in the Holocaust, as a volunteer for the draft for the U.S. Army who entered service prior to Pearl Harbor, as a participant of D-Day invasions of both North Africa and Sicily, having been wounded in action in Normandy, as a recipient of the purple heart, the bronze star, and the Belgian Croix de Guerre Avec Palme, but above all as an American, I am sickened and offended by the insensitivity displayed toward the memory of the thousands of American servicemen killed by those whose graves you intend to visit on your upcoming trip to Germany.—Siegmond Spiegel, 5th District, New York.

One doesn't have to be a World War II veteran or Jewish to resent the idea of the President of the United States honoring Nazi war dead. . . . Millions of mature 60 plus and elderly 70 plus Americans, like us remember vividly Allied sacrifices in World War II—including American prisoners of War butchered by Nazi troops near that cemetery. . . . Many living Germans were part of Hitler's efforts to build a Reich that would rule the world. . . . Honoring all war dead is a meaningless blurring of the fact that many of those dead don't deserve honor.—Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Magnell, 5th District, New York.

As a combat veteran of WW II, I feel debased by President Reagan's decision to visit the German cemetery that holds the remains of so many of the Nazi criminals of that conflict. . . . We can never let the world forget what the Germans of that era did to humanity. To honor those who participated in that horror is an insult, not only to Americans, but to all people, all over the world who value the right of every human to be allowed to think and worship according to his own beliefs.—Mr. Gil Malawista, 5th District, New York.

I share the concern and opposition expressed by my constituents. Currently, there are numerous groups trying to convince the world that the Holocaust never took place. This offensive and preposterous assertion is sure to gain some acceptance if the President lays a wreath at a cemetery where members of the elite SS guard are buried.

The fundamental lesson of the Holocaust is never again. As elected representatives of our Nation, our responsibility is to assure that this lesson never fades. I commend the gentleman from California and New York for reserving this time so that this very expression may be relayed to the President.●

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a deep sense of outrage at President Reagan's proposed plan to visit the cemetery at Bitburg, Germany. This cemetery contains the graves of German SS officers, the Nazi

elites who brutally carried out Hitler's plan to exterminate the Jews of Europe. Regardless of the intent of including Bitburg on the President's itinerary, or the addition of other events to the schedule, President Reagan should immediately cancel his plan to lay a wreath at Bitburg.

This month we have been commemorating the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II and the liberation of the Nazi death camps. Part of remembering the dead and the other victims of nazism is never forgetting those responsible for the Holocaust. President Reagan's plan to lay a wreath at Bitburg is far from a gesture of reconciliation with modern Germany. Rather it is opening the wounds of thousands of Holocaust survivors and Gold Star mothers everywhere. Furthermore, it is paying homage to the memory of 47 Nazi SS members, participants in the torture and murder of millions of innocent people.

I have written personally to President Reagan asking him to remove Bitburg from his itinerary. In my letter I also encouraged him to do everything possible to continue our Nation's friendship with present-day Germany. I do not believe in collective guilt. But I must join with Elie Wiesel who said: "The issue here is not politics, but good and evil." The American President's place is with the victims, not the perpetrators, of Nazi atrocities.

Our current friendship with Germany does not make us forget the past. Out of respect for those who died and suffered, out of respect for the lessons of the Holocaust, I join with my colleagues and friends in the Jewish community in calling for the President to cancel his trip to Bitburg.●

● Mr. LENT. Madam Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in expressing my deep concern over the President's plans to visit the Bitburg Cemetery in West Germany. The President's trip to Bitburg is intended to improve diplomatic relations with Germany but it has had the opposite effect here in the United States. The President's stated intention to visit a military cemetery in Bitburg has opened old wounds and sharply divided this Nation.

Some would portray this visit as an issue of primary concern to the Jewish community, but that is inaccurate. It is a Jewish issue, but it is also an issue of concern to gentiles. Many of the major veterans organizations have protested against the President's visit. They are disturbed because the President's visit would honor the murderers of their fallen comrades, as well as the perpetrators of the most horrifying slaughter in the history of mankind.

I had hoped that the eloquent speech given by Elie Wiesel at the White House last week would change

the President's mind and show him the folly of his plans. While I sincerely believe the President was deeply moved by Mr. Wiesel's words, he apparently feels that he has made some personal commitment to Chancellor Kohl as one head of government to another.

The administration should recognize that a decision that causes such controversy at home is worthless, no matter what its value abroad. They should be working with the West Germans to develop an option that will benefit both sides and alienate no one. I join with Elie Wiesel and the countless others who believe that the President's place is not in Bitburg, his place is with the victims.●

● Mr. ADDABBO. Madam Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in urging President Reagan to cancel his visit to Bitburg Cemetery.

Certainly none of us has a problem with the President's stated desire to commemorate 40 years of peace and friendship with the people and Government of West Germany. But in doing so, the President must not ignore the horrors and brutality of the Nazi regime and should scrupulously avoid even the appearance of paying tribute to individuals who perpetrated crimes against humanity.

If the President wants to honor the victims of World War II, he does not have to look very far. All of Europe was a victim of the Nazi regime. The millions who were murdered in the death camps, the fallen soldiers of the Allied forces, the people and towns of Europe that were overrun and occupied by the Nazi war machine, the fighters in the German resistance movement, all were victims and all deserve to be honored by the President of the United States.

I am sure that it was never the President's intention to honor members of the SS. The planned visit to Bitburg was simply a result of poor judgment and bad advice. The most honorable course of action would be to admit the error and cancel the visit to the cemetery. I respectfully urge the President to reconsider his plans. It is not too late to find an alternative site for the President to mark 40 years of peace.●

● Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Madam Speaker, the proposed visit by President Reagan to the German war cemetery at Bitburg, billed as symbolic of our reconciliation with present-day Germany, actually undermines the genuine reconciliation our present alliance with Germany symbolizes. The juxtaposition of the symbol of reconciliation with that entombed in those graves, the greatest evil the world has suffered, can only pervert the symbol of reconciliation which we wish to express. We cannot reconcile ourselves with the past and its nefarious symbols. The SS, the elite corps of Nazi

Germany, perpetrated the most grievous crimes against humanity ever recorded in history. The Nazis distorted the distinction between good and evil through the very distortion and perversion of symbols: the ones who at the gate of the death camp inscribed "Work makes Free"; the ones who called their mass deportations to death camps "resettlement"; the ones who sent their victims to the "showers" to "disinfect" them; the ones whose "Final Solution" meant the total annihilation of a whole people. Madam Speaker, how can we even symbolically reconcile ourselves with this past?

As the leader of the free world, President Reagan has the responsibility to honor and uphold the values for which countless Americans fought and died in their struggle to free Europe from the Nazi tyranny which almost engulfed the world. Americans fought for the preservation of freedom in the world; for the survival of democracy which affords its citizens equal protection under law. And many died for the free Europe we have today; including democratic West Germany. Is it then fitting for the beneficiaries of this legacy of freedom to reconcile themselves with the very evil which would undermine our hard-won liberties?

Madam Speaker, I join my appeal with those of my colleagues that he cancel his visit to the Bitburg Cemetery; a visit that only revives memories of Nazi atrocities and reopens bitter wounds. Mr. Reagan would demonstrate true leadership if he were to cancel his proposed visit to the cemetery.

Madam Speaker, the reconciliation that has, in fact, existed for some time cannot be justified if it rests on the scattered cinders of forgetfulness.●

● Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Speaker, President Reagan's decision to carry out his plans to visit the Bitburg Cemetery honors those directly responsible for the deaths of millions of American soldiers and Jews. Those buried in this cemetery are the perpetrators of some of the greatest crimes of humanity during this century. Many of the German soldiers buried at Bitburg were members of the Waffen SS, the combat arm of an elite Nazi unit.

As a Jew who has personally suffered family losses, I am outraged that 40 years after the end of the world's most atrocious regime, the President of the United States intends to honor the German military war dead. This is an indignation that offends not only the souls of the 6 million Jews who were slaughtered at the hands of the Nazis, but the 400,000 American servicemen who lost their lives in World War II as well. Rather than healing old wounds, this has opened them up again. Rather than increasing understanding, it increases misunderstanding.

ing. Rather than celebrating the future, it has rekindled the horrors of the past.

After observing the sense of outrage from nearly all sectors of the American population, the President was quick to add a stop at the Bergen-Belsen Concentration Camp to his itinerary; however, he continues to include the Bitburg ceremony on his schedule. Visiting the site of a Nazi concentration camp where tens of thousands of Jews were brutally murdered cannot be considered a trade-off to visiting Bitburg.

To voice my opposition to the President's planned trip to Bitburg Cemetery, I have cosigned several letters with many of my colleagues advising the President of Congress' belief that there is a more appropriate way to highlight the peace and friendship between West Germany and the United States. In addition, I am an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 125, a sense of the Congress resolution that the President of the United States should not honor the memory of those responsible for the deaths of millions by visiting Bitburg.

We should not honor the guilty. We know the pain of remembering the Nazi genocide and feel the loss of each life as if it were our own. Hitler's reign ended 40 years ago, but for the many who survived the camps, the hiding, and the awful waiting, it happened yesterday. Therefore, we must remember, not honor, the Nazi barbarism, so that it may never happen again.●

● Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, our President leaves tomorrow on a 10-day trip to Europe. Our President intends to visit a West German cemetery at Bitburg where 47 of the Third Reich's notorious Waffen (weapons) SS troops, as well as 2,000 German soldiers, lay buried. Many Americans, I being among them, strongly believe the President's plan to honor these men is ill-advised and insensitive.

Just 40 years ago, 6 million Jews, plus millions of other innocent people, were murdered in the Nazi Holocaust—victims of the SS organization that once included the 47 who lay buried at Bitburg. The aim of the SS was, according to SS leader Heinrich Himmler, to "find out, to fight and destroy all open and secret enemies of the Fuhrer, the national socialist movement and our racial resurrection." For a U.S. President to honor men with such a mission shows a tragic lack of understanding of Nazi atrocities.

Most of the soldiers buried at Bitburg died in the Battle of the Bulge in 1944, the most ferocious battle ever fought between Americans and Germans. Over 19,000 of our GI's died; about 50,000 were wounded. Every veteran who fought in this battle has vivid and bitter memories. Many will

recall the news that during the battle, a Waffen SS battle group gunned down 71 American prisoners of war captured just north of Bitburg. Afterward, the SS soldiers used the bodies for target practice.

The President's decision to lay a wreath at Bitburg demonstrates a lack of sensitivity to those who suffered at the hands of the Nazis. The President should reconsider the inclusion of the Bitburg Cemetery in his forthcoming trip to West Germany. Instead, our Nation should pay honor to the memories of the millions of innocent Jewish victims and thousands of American and Allied soldiers who were victims of Nazi atrocities. We should honor the new bonds that have developed between our Nation and West Germany since World War II and in doing this look forward to a promising and flourishing relationship, not backward to the horrors of the past. ●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEVINE of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FRANK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order now, which was previously called.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

A BROKEN PROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FRANK. Madam Speaker, the gentleman who preceded me, the gentleman from California, said that special orders ought to be used when one feels strongly, and that is precisely what I want to do today. I feel strongly for a couple reasons.

The subject is the very solemn, oft-repeated promise, that President Reagan made during the 1984 campaign that he would not reduce Social Security benefits and the fact that he has subsequently broken that promise.

Apparently when the initials S.S. are involved, the President has a somewhat flexible attitude toward promise-keeping. When the S.S. stands for Social Security, the promise is not worth very much. When it stands for Schutzstaffel, then apparently it is an

obligation too solemn ever to be set aside.

I think the President is keeping the wrong promise. A commitment made in a conversation to the head of another government when nothing has been bargained for over that does not seem to me as important as the very solemn, very public pledge, made by the President of the United States as a candidate for reelection to the American people, when he said, "I won't be cutting your Social Security benefits."

□ 1620

Because the President has a proposal now before the Congress to reduce Social Security benefits by a substantial amount. In fact, a proposal came forward from the other body to reduce Social Security benefits, and in the compromise that was worked out, the President went them one better because the proposal that came forward as part of a so-called compromise for a 3-year reduction in the cost-of-living increase that Social Security recipients would be entitled to get is a deeper cut over that 3-year period than what had initially come out.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Does the gentleman recall one of the Presidential debates in which the President said "You should never say never in politics, but I will say never"?

Mr. FRANK. I do recall that, and what he said never about, as the gentleman points out, was cutting Social Security benefits.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. That is precisely what he said: "I will never allow Social Security benefits to be cut." That was just several months ago. The paradox of this whole thing is that this President is participating in an effort that will lower Social Security checks from the present law's COLA in order to counter a buildup on the other side of the budget for the military. And that is precisely what we are talking about. We are talking about taking money from senior citizens, many of whom are at or near the poverty line, in order to build more submarines, jet fighters, tanks, or MX missiles.

The President's budget priorities are misplaced, and I appreciate the gentleman taking this special order to point that out.

Mr. FRANK. I thank my friend from North Dakota who has been a very staunch advocate for sensible priorities in the budget. He reminds us we are not talking about increased overall Federal spending. We are not talking about trying to increase what the President sent us in the deficit. We are talking about making those reductions in a sensible way and not taking Social Security benefits away from those

who are entitled to them to fund General Dynamics' abuses of taxpayers' money or for MX missiles that we do not need or other waste elsewhere in the budget.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. If you deny someone, whose purchasing power has been eroded because of inflation, the opportunity to have that purchasing power restored through a COLA, that denial of those funds does not help the deficit. Social Security funds are raised through a payroll tax to be used only for Social Security. Some people around here are trying to play a game of using those Social Security revenues that they cannot use to offset deficits they create by an excess of military spending. That breeds the most incredible waste we have ever seen in this Government's history.

Mr. FRANK. The gentleman is correct.

You know, sometimes people forget what today is. But now the gentleman reminds me, and we can say, if people do not remember what the day is, today is the first of never, apparently, because we heard the President say he would never cut Social Security benefits, and he is now proposing to cut them. So as of today, it is the first of never.

I do not know what you do to your clock, but what you do, if you are old, to your bank account is watch it dwindle.

The gentleman is right. In 1983, the President signed into law, both Houses having passed an increase in Social Security taxes and a reduction at that point in Social Security benefits. And the argument was that that was necessary.

Some agreed; some disagreed. But that was then argued to be necessary to put Social Security on a sound footing so that the elderly would not have to worry.

What the President is now asking Congress to do is to take part of that increase in the regressive payroll tax of Social Security and use it to offset the deficit that we are getting because of General Dynamics abusers and because we are going to do the things in the military that are far beyond what we have to do.

We ought to be very clear about what the President has tried to suggest. Let us be very clear. When you have a law that now says elderly people are supposed to get every January—it used to be July but it has been pushed back 6 months—a cost-of-living increase equal to inflation, and you take that away from them, you are reducing their benefits below what they are now legally entitled to.

And then the President said, anyone who says I am reducing their benefits is lying in their teeth. I do not know how one lies in one's teeth and it

would seem to me that it would be a very uncomfortable place to lie. But the fact is that the President's own calculation means that, in this one instance, he does understand what we are talking about.

He is the one who tells us that if we only give the Pentagon a 3-percent increase over and above inflation, that is a 7-percent overall increase, that that is austerity. So, for the Pentagon, they get full inflationary compensation plus 3 percent.

But if you are 82 years old and living at about the poverty level, receiving about \$500 a month or a little bit less, you get 2 percent. And the President says he has not cut you and we know that that simply is not true.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. If the gentleman will yield one more time—those who listen to the gentleman and others should not conclude that we are not for trying to move this fiscal policy into some sort of balance. The mismatch between revenues this Government has and expenditures that the President proposes, which is a \$180 billion deficit mismatch, has nothing at all to do with Social Security COLA's. We ought to adjust Social Security COLA's up or down based on the economic health of that system, not based on whether or not the President wants another 7, 9, or 13 percent in military spending.

This does not have anything at all to do with the general question of whether or not we ought to restrain spending. Of course we should. But we ought to do it in the right way.

Mr. FRANK. I just want to make it clear. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Larry Speakes, who is the official White House spokesperson—and, Madam Speaker, in the intermittent interest that some of the people on the Republican side have about the rules, I am going to ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to quote. I would assure any Republicans watching, I am going to quote Larry Speakes, so I am sure they would not have any objection.

I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to quote from some documents here, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mrs. BURTON of California]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the Speaker.

On October 9, and I am going to insert some stuff in the RECORD, and one is a superb, thoughtful essay written by Robert Ball, a former Commissioner of Social Security, a man who participated in 1982 and 1983 in the proposal to reduce benefits at that time and raise taxes because he thought it was necessary, he has a magnificent refutation of the logic by which the President is trying to justify.

And let us be very clear what the President has done. He made a promise when he ran for election that he would never cut Social Security benefits. He has broken that promise. He has asked the Congress to reduce the cost of living below what it now legally is supposed to be, not just for this fiscal year but for 2 additional fiscal years. For 3 full fiscal years, it would cost billions of dollars and put an awful lot of older people who are now barely above poverty back into poverty.

Here is what Mr. Speakes said, according to Mr. Ball:

When asked further on October 9 about the Social Security cost-of-living adjustment, White House spokesman Larry Speakes, and a reporter had this exchange:

"QUESTION. You say that benefits will not be reduced. The law includes a provision for increases in benefits based on cost of living. Does this guarantee those increases as well?"

"MR. SPEAKES. Yes. This is the law."

"QUESTION. And you say it doesn't include—that there will be no tampering and delaying or trimming of the cost of living?"

"MR. SPEAKES. No tampering, no nothing."

But unfortunately no nothing more clearly explains the Reagan program for Social Security recipients than no tampering. There is a clearcut violation of a pledge and an effort to reduce what, among the poorest people in this society, all older people living in poverty are going to get.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank him for asking for this time in order that we might explore this issue on Social Security because I think there has been a lot of misexplanation of what is going on. And a lot of people are being asked to think that freezing Social Security benefits or reducing the cost of living over a 3-year period by at least 2 percent every year is somehow a form of deficit reduction, and some kind of budget restraint, when it is nothing of the kind.

I think an important fact that should be emphasized is that the Social Security trust fund will take in \$9.2 billion more next year, in 1986, than it is going to spend. So, if anything, the Social Security trust fund is making the deficit look smaller than it actually is, not bigger.

Mr. FRANK. If I could just interrupt the gentleman, I appreciate his statistics. If I am correct, the \$9.2 billion is even if we pay out the currently mandated cost of living?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Absolutely. And I think it is important to go back and understand why it is we are in this fix where the dedicated funds in Social Security are made to look like they are reducing the deficit.

In fact, back in the 1960's and before the Social Security fund was kept sep-

arate from the Federal budget, because we understood that these dollars could not be used to fund other parts of the budget, they cannot be used for the military budget, they cannot be used for housing or for educational loans, and as such this money is not really available. But in 1969, the budgets were brought together and at that time the surplus in Social Security was used to hide the fact that we were running a deficit that we should not have been running then.

□ 1630

And here again we have got the same kind of a strategy. I wanted to underscore something that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] mentioned, and that is in 1983 the people of this country were told that we had to compromise, which we needed in Social Security, and that people, workers, would have to pay higher taxes and employers would have to pay higher taxes during the 1980's to ensure that the cost of living increases could be paid, that senior citizens would have to do without the cost-of-living increase for a 6-month period, which is a permanent reduction in people's benefits; but that was in order to secure the Social Security system for 75 years.

Well, here we are already 2 years later being told that this lead is off and, in fact, those tax increases which the gentleman quite properly describes as regressive, are to be used for something else, for a deficit reduction.

Well, I think that those who are advocating this reduction in Social Security benefits better be advocating giving those tax increases back to the workers and the employers. I cannot imagine any Member of this House coming on the floor and saying that he had a tax program to deal with the deficit and then saying the following: This tax program is only going to be on earned income, not on unearned income. You are only going to have to pay on the first \$39,600 that you earn. If you earn more than that, that will be tax-exempt.

And if you are an employer you will pay no matter whether you are losing money or making money, you will still have to pay this tax. And any Member who came here proposing that kind of a tax increase to fight the budget deficit would not get one supporter.

Yet that is exactly what is being proposed with the cuts in Social Security.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman.

Let us drive this point home because people have to understand what the President of the United States is doing. He is, by his own description, Mr. Anti-Tax Increase.

You remember he made a couple of promises last year. One promise he made was no new increase in taxes, and when someone even suggested it,

somebody on his side or somebody on the Democratic side, it came from both places, his answer was, "Make my day."

When someone talks about his promise not to raise taxes, he is Clint Eastwood. Of course, when someone says that they are going to violate his campaign promise not to cut Social Security benefits, he is Woody Allen. I mean he becomes a somewhat different character, or the Roadrunner, perhaps, getting as far away from his promises as he can.

But let us look at the effect of what his own tax policy is.

In 1983 his appointed commissioners, along with others, recommended an increase in the Social Security tax. That increase came from some people that Ronald Reagan, among others, the Speaker and the Senate majority leader, appointed.

He lobbied for and signed into law, Ronald Reagan, an increase in Social Security tax affecting every wage-earner in this country and the self-employed small business people; Ronald Reagan's appointees recommended the tax; Ronald Reagan lobbied for the tax; Ronald Reagan signed the tax into law, ostensibly to pay for Social Security benefits. Now he is asking Congress to take that tax increase he signed into law ostensibly to pay for Social Security benefits and to use it for his military foreign assistance; some will go to the Philippines, some will go to build an airport in Grenada, some of it will go to fly General Dynamics people around and not have them pay any taxes, some of it will go for the MX, some of it will go for some other purposes, some of it which might be useful purposes. But he has taken that tax increase that was explicitly to be used only for Social Security and ask us not to provide Social Security cost-of-living increases. As the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON] pointed out, even if the law, as it now stands is followed, and you know people are not getting rich off of Social Security. There is a small number of wealthy people who get Social Security. But the great bulk are not wealthy. Social Security continues to be the most effective, most broadly ranging antipoverty program in America today in the sense that it keeps people from that poverty line. And Ronald Reagan is going to deny them the money even though there will be under current law a \$9 billion surplus generated by Social Security. I think he is trying to scoop some money from the Social Security trust fund and use it to cover up the deficit.

I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I think that is exactly right. That should be disturbing to everyone who believes that the Social Security trust fund is a separate fund that guaran-

tees our ability to keep the compact we have made between generations, that that trust fund will be maintained. This is the kind of step, once taken, that could easily be repeated time and time again.

I would emphasize that those who are supporting this 2-percent reduction in the COLA, they were talking about this change long ago, long before this particular proposal. They are not talking about deficit reduction; they are talking about Social Security reductions; CPI minus 2. We have heard that around this Chamber for 2 or 3 years now. This is a specific proposal. Those individuals have the right to advocate it, but they ought not hide it as if it were a deficit reduction. They want to reduce Social Security benefits. Let us debate that on its own terms. I think it will lose on its own terms.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut. He is absolutely right. There are people who have the bizarre notion that on the whole, old people in America have too much money. I must say, as any Member of Congress, that I meet with a lot of elderly people. I know the gentleman from Connecticut does because he has been very active on behalf of the elderly. I want to know where they are hiding all these rich old people, because I would like to find them, befriend them; maybe they will be nice to me. I have a lot of old people in my district, most of whom are nice to me, but unfortunately I have not found all of these rich ones.

I just want to make some statistical points here because it is true there are a few people who are on Social Security who are very wealthy. But the bulk of the people on Social Security are average working people who in their retirement years would be living in desperate poverty if we did not have a decent Social Security program.

Some of the people on Social Security are still in poverty. What the President is asking us to do is to deny compensation for the cost of living for the next 3 years to people who are living in poverty or who are just above poverty.

The Pentagon, remember, gets a full cost-of-living increase plus a 3-percent bonus under his plan. Elderly people get less than a third of that.

Let me read from a very useful report which I am going to put into the RECORD from the Democratic Study Group, "Rose Garden II." CBO estimates that Social Security, along with railroad retirement, provides 82 percent of total income for elderly recipient families classified as poor; 79 percent of people classified as near poor, income is less than 20 percent above the poverty line. It is a very important source, in addition, for many low-income persons who are not elderly, but who are disabled, who are wid-

owers or widows caring for children. All of them are victimized.

CBO has said that the President's proposal to reduce the Social Security cost-of-living increase will do more to increase poverty than any other proposal before us or any other economic event of recent times. And it will also degrade those who are just above poverty.

Is there insistence that elderly people, having worked hard all their lives in factories, in stores, in hospitals, having raised children, that it is somehow a crime for them to be a little bit above the poverty level? Because that is what we are talking about. We are not talking about a proposal aimed at denying Social Security cost-of-living increases to a handful of wealthy people. President Reagan is asking that we deny half of the Social Security increase that elderly people are now legally entitled to get for the next 3 years up and down the line. The poorest people in this country by the hundreds of thousands will be victimized by this breach of promise by the President of the United States.

I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think those statistics are very telling.

Another CBO statistic that I think drives this point home is that the Senate proposal, the Senate proposal that the President has endorsed and agreed to, the reduction in the COLA for the next 3 years, would put 650,000 senior citizens who are now at or above the poverty line into poverty.

We have already driven 250,000 senior citizens into that status by that 6-month cost-of-living delay in 1983. This is 650,000 more people.

Now we will hear some people argue that the problem is solved by a small increase in the so-called SSI, the supplementary security income program and that that solves the problem. The fact is that it does nothing of the kind. The SSI benefits are themselves below the poverty line. So people who benefit from that will not be raised to poverty, but will be allowed to sink even lower, lower below the poverty line. And those who are in such desperate straits that they need to avail themselves of that program, will have to give up everything they saved in their lives. Virtually nothing in terms of assets can be held by a person who gets those kinds of benefits. So these people not only will be kept below poverty but pushed into even greater destitution by that plan that has been endorsed by the President.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman because the increase in SSI does not begin to undo the misery that will be inflicted on hard-working older people

by this. I want to stress that because we are told that we have to be tough; people are going to say, "Well, these are tough times, so be tough." I do not mind people being tough in tough times; I do not mind people being tough in tender times. People who like being tough are entitled to be tough.

□ 1640

But how do you prove your toughness by saying to an 83-year-old woman living in a major metropolitan center, in an expensive, high cost-of-living area where she has lived all her life, and now she has no relatives left and no friends, and she is living entirely on Social Security and she is maybe getting \$500 a month.

You prove your toughness by telling her that for the next 3 years she will get only half of the cost-of-living increase? That as her food goes up, her rent goes up and her light bill goes up, and her health care and her transportation goes up, she will get half what it needs to pay them?

I wish people with this need to show their macho would find someone other than these 83-year-old vulnerable people on whom to demonstrate it.

There are plenty of areas in this Federal budget. Let's look at the Pentagon. Let's look at the agricultural program. Let's look at almost any other place you want. And it is compounded by the fact that the President of the United States made this solemn promise.

We are being told—it is not simply a rhetorical ploy—we are being told by our friends, "Well, yes, he shouldn't go to the cemetery at Bitburg and he shouldn't go and honor the SS, but he promised." The promise he gave, over the phone or in person to Helmut Kohl, why is that so absolutely unbreakable when the election pledge he made—he said to people, in effect, and you do this when you are a candidate—"If you vote for me, I promise that I will not cut Social Security." He solicited people's votes.

Older people have been frightened. Let's make a couple points. The gentleman from Connecticut made another excellent point that I want to just echo, when he talked about the intergenerational compact.

Because when taxes were increased on Social Security in 1983, when people who are now in their twenties and thirties and forties who are working, were asked to pay more in their taxes, they were told that was to go to build up the trust fund so there would be no question that when they reach retirement age, there would be adequate funds for them.

When the President starts cutting now—what he is asking in effect is that we accept the principle that we will not just look at those trust funds as means of paying for future cost-of-living increases; we will consider them

somehow as a pot that can be used to reduce the deficit; that we will try to build up the trust fund, but not to pay our legal obligations; but rather to accumulate surpluses that can offset deficits elsewhere.

Let us talk about the elderly and Social Security. Some people have this crazy notion that reducing poverty among the elderly was something we should be embarrassed about. Not just reducing poverty, reducing near-poverty.

I do not think older people ought to be living at the absolute margin, afraid that an illness is going to wipe them out or any kind of unforeseen financial exigency will wipe them out.

In 1972, Social Security was indexed. It was done a little bit too much. Since that time, look what has happened: In 1977, the Notch Act and its accompaniments reduced Social Security. Then the Consumer Price Index was recalculated, because people said old people are getting too much, because they are getting too compensated for housing costs they do not have. So the CPI that they get is not as high as the one that they used to get.

Then in 1983 their benefits were reduced further; the cost of living was cut in half by being put back for 6 months. It is not as if nothing has happened.

After all of these things have happened, after three separate reductions in the law indexing Social Security benefits, after an increase in taxes to pay for Social Security benefits, with Social Security cost-of-living already having been reduced, with people born in the notch years suffering I think unjustly, with the Social Security trust fund in surplus, Ronald Reagan says:

I need to give a 7-percent increase to the Pentagon, and therefore I have to cut in half the cost-of-living increase that Social Security recipients are entitled to.

He breaks his promise, an explicit, solemn promise. I think it is significant—as we know, our friends on the other side of the aisle have been very combative lately, and they are usually here to defend their President. I have never seen them as eloquent as I see them now by their absolute and complete silence, because they know—some of them are pretty good lawyers—when they have got an unsellable case. They know that the President of the United States made a promise; his press secretary said the promise includes not cutting benefits under cost of living, and it is being broken. It is being broken for no good fiscal reason but because some people have harbored this agenda—the gentleman from Connecticut has pointed out—they think old people have too much money, and we look at this whole Federal budget, and they look at military assistance for Marcos in the Philippines, and they look at the

MX missile and star wars, and they look at some of the pork barrel projects and they say "Gee, we better cut cost-of-living increases for Social Security."

I yield again to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I just want to say one more thing, and that is that I worry very much about where this is bound, in the future, if we start down this road. The President made his promise and it was, no more than 1 month ago that he was saying, "We're wasting a lot of time looking to Social Security to solve our deficit problem. It doesn't do anything for our deficit problem."

Just like he was right to promise not to cut, and he was right to say that, now he has reversed himself. We all know that in his budget proposal, he does not deal with the deficit; he does not get it down to any reasonable level at any time in the near future.

That means that next year, if we take this step, we will just be called on again to look at the same list of sources of cuts.

I think the senior citizens of America deserve a strong, unequivocal statement from this Congress that it is not going to be tampering with Social Security in the future, and I am very pleased that the gentleman from Massachusetts has scheduled this time so that we could lay before our colleagues how fallacious and erroneous is the proposal that to show that we are strong on reducing the deficit, which I think we are committed to doing the job, that we somehow have to beat up on senior citizens, to beat up on Social Security recipients, in order to justify doing what is right in asking fiscal prudence from other parts of our Federal budget.

Mr. FRANK. I am going to conclude, Madam Speaker. Let me just read from Mr. Robert Ball under the unanimous consent that I was given earlier that allows me to read.

Mr. Ball says:

There is a mistaken notion—that has recently gained some currency—that Social Security, because it has no needs test, is somehow a middle-class program. Social Security is a universal program, and, of course, does cover the middle class—

Although let me say as my aside, the middle class, having contributed to the program, I do not understand why anyone ought to think it is wrong, and older retired middle class people, or to benefit from them; of course they should—

but it is also our most effective antipoverty program. If there were no Social Security, there would be about 3.5 elderly poor persons for every 1 not below the poverty level.

Absent Social Security, 3.5 times as many elderly people would now be in poverty.

Social Security cuts the incidence of poverty among the elderly by over 70 percent. Nine to ten million people above 65 are kept above the rock-bottom poverty level by Social Security, and four to five million other social security beneficiaries are kept above the poverty level by their benefits. Millions more would have income only slightly above if it were not for Social Security.

Mr. Ball also points out, this is a permanent cut, not a 3-year cut. Because by reducing each year the amount people would get, you are reducing the base on which future increases come. This is a denial of billions of dollars. There are literally about \$5.7 billion now, and I think it is ultimately \$12 billion over 3 years that the elderly are entitled to.

People in the other body proposed, in their budget proposal, reducing Social Security benefits for 1 year. Understand that in this case, the President's compromise made it worse. Donald Regan says—the President's Chief of Staff—that he was the one, on behalf of the President, who suggested that.

So let us just quickly summarize where we are. Ronald Reagan, in his campaign for reelection, in his debates, through his press secretary, made a solemn pledge to the voters that if they voted for him and reelected him President, he would not reduce cost-of-living increases to Social Security recipients. He invited people to break that promise.

He has now joined in breaking the promise himself. The Pentagon will get a 7-percent increase. The waste will get an increase as well as what we need; the muscle as well as the fat.

Other areas of the program that he supports will get increases. The Social Security tax increase that he signed into law 2 years ago will not go to the purposes for which it was intended, if he has his way. It will not go to pay the cost-of-living increase. If he has his way, hundreds of thousands of elderly people; 650,000 the gentleman from Connecticut points out, who are now in poverty, will fall into poverty.

Millions more will have a reduction in the cost of living and you can say, Well, it is only 2 percent this year. And 2 percent next year and 2 percent the year after. So there is a 6-percent deterioration in their cost of living.

These are not people, on the whole, who are living so high on the hog—and of course, the President would also increase the amount they have to pay out for medical bills by raising Medicare fees, and some of them who happen to live in subsidized housing would have increases there, and that public transportation that many of them have to use would go up.

The President's budget is an assault on the elderly, including the poor elderly, middle-income elderly, in flagrant violation of the campaign prom-

ise he made. That promise may not be very important to him.

I think campaign promises ought to be treated as a very important obligation by all of us who go and say to people, "If you vote for me, if you give me the most sacred thing you have got in our democratic system, your ballot—from the standpoint of that system, then I will honor any kind of obligation I undertake to you."

□ 1650

The President was not forced to make that promise. He volunteered it. He reached out to make it. There is no economic justification for cutting the cost of living increase that Social Security recipients are now legally entitled to get. There is no moral justification. There is no justification in terms of the deficit.

The President is wrong to have made that promise and to have so callously broken it, and I hope that the majority of the Members of this Chamber will remember the older people have a legitimate expectation not to get rich when they retire, not to become people who are living in luxury, but they have a legitimate expectation that there will not be on retirement a drastic reduction in their standard of living. To say to older people that they are going to get a 6-percent drop in their real standard of living over the next 3 years, with everything else that is going on in Ronald Reagan's budget, is wholly unjustified, and I hope the House will not yield to it.

Madam Speaker, as previously mentioned, I am including in the RECORD at this point a letter from Robert M. Ball, and other extraneous material:

WASHINGTON DC,
January 25, 1985.

Congressman BARNEY FRANK,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK: I thought the enclosure might be useful to you during the current congressional consideration of possible changes in the cost-of-living adjustment for social security beneficiaries. As you can see, I think it is a bad idea.

Cordially,

ROBERT M. BALL,
(Commissioner of Social Security,
1962-73).

[Study Group on Social Security, New York,
NY]

CUTTING OR SKIPPING THE COST-OF-LIVING
ADJUSTMENT (COLA) FOR SOCIAL SECURITY
BENEFICIARIES IS UNWISE AND UNFAIR—
JANUARY 18, 1985

(By Robert M. Ball)*

1. Cutting the COLA is a benefit cut for 36 million social security beneficiaries.

The COLA is an integral part of the basic social security (old-age, survivors and disability insurance) system and the financing of the program, which is fully adequate, is designed to pay for the COLA. The COLA is not a benefit increase. The adjustment

merely maintains the purchasing power of the benefit.

2. The separately and adequately financed social security program is not contributing to the deficit and should not be cut because taxes are too low to pay for other domestic and military spending.

Social security is not contributing one cent to the deficit. On the contrary, the deficit in the consolidated budget is being reduced because of social security. In order to build up reserves, social security will be taking in more than it pays out for several decades. This, of course, helps overall government financing. Social security funds that are not needed for the payment of benefits are lent to the government at interest. Thus other activities can be partially financed by borrowing from social security without the government going into the financial markets and competing with private industry.

3. The overwhelming majority of social security beneficiaries have low incomes.

Social security supplies more than half the income for two-thirds of its over-65 beneficiaries. About one-third get more than 90 percent of their income from social security. Yet the average benefit payment is less than \$450 a month. An estimated 500,000 people would be pushed below the government's rock-bottom measure of dire poverty if their purchasing power were cut by a COLA freeze. If the increase in the Consumer Price Index for next year is 4 percent, the average monthly cut for beneficiaries would be \$18, if 5 percent, \$22.50 a month. These amounts may sound small to some, but to people largely dependent on social security, these cuts can mean choosing between food and medicine.

There is a mistaken notion—that has recently gained some currency—that social security, because it has no needs test, is somehow a middle-class program. Social security is a universal program, and, of course, does cover the middle class, but it is also our most effective anti-poverty program. If there were no social security, there would be about 3.5 elderly poor persons for every 1 now below the poverty level. Social security cuts the incidence of poverty among the elderly by over 70 percent. Nine to ten million people over 65 are kept above the rock-bottom poverty level by social security, and four to five million other social security beneficiaries are also kept above the poverty level by their benefits. Millions more would have incomes only slightly above poverty if it were not for social security. Whittling away at social security benefits will reverse the progress that has been made and plunge additional people into the poor and near-poor category.

4. Cutting the COLA for even one year is a permanent cut.

Cutting the COLA is a cut in benefits that continues year after year for all those who are on the benefit rolls at the time the COLA is due to be paid. For them, in each year that follows, a new COLA is applied to a lower benefit than would otherwise be the case so that they never catch up with inflation.

5. Cutting the COLA introduces unfair treatment among beneficiaries.

Those who are on the benefit rolls next December would have their benefits cut. On the other hand, those who apply after 1985 will receive full benefits, unless, as many will fear, the freeze is extended.

6. Modifying social security commitments in ways unrelated to social security purposes undermines faith in the program.

*Commissioner of Social Security 1962-73 and member of the 1982-83 National Commission on Social Security Reform.

Social security promises rest on past earnings and contributions and stretch into the distant future. Workers today are paying for protection that in part will not be realized for 20, 30 or 40 years in the future. To modify benefit promises in ways unrelated to social security needs or purposes would further weaken faith in the system, and, indeed, in the promises of government itself.

The law provides that social security should be inflation-proof. People are counting on it. The President has reenforced the promise in the law by an unequivocal pledge not to cut social security protection, including the cost-of-living benefits. During the debate with Mr. Mondale on October 7, 1984, the President said:

"I will never reduce social security benefits to people who are now getting them."

Two days later on October 9 an official statement went further, saying:

"The President will never stand for reduction of social security for anybody, those now getting them or future recipients."

When questioned further on October 9 about the social security cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), White House spokesman, Larry Speakes and a reporter had this exchange:

Question: "You say that benefits will not be reduced. The law includes a provision for increases in benefits based on cost of living. Does this guarantee those increases as well?"

Mr. Speakes: "Yes. This is the law."

Question: "And you say it doesn't include—that there'll be no tampering and delaying or trimming of cost of living?"

Mr. Speakes: "No tampering. No nothing." The American people voted in 1984 partly on the basis of this commitment made by the President so that for both substantive reasons and because the integrity of the Presidency is at stake, social security should not be part of the deficit reduction effort.

7. Cutting the COLA will break the agreement implicit in the 1983 Amendments.

All during 1981 and 1982, social security beneficiaries—36 million people, principally elderly retired persons, totally disabled people, widows and motherless and fatherless children—were terrorized by the fear that their benefits would stop or be reduced. There were almost daily reports of social security "bankruptcy." Under this daily pounding, a high proportion of the 120 million contributors to the program became convinced that they would never receive the benefits toward which they were contributing. The Nation was greatly disturbed by the possibility that the government might turn its back on the commitments it had made over the last 50 years. The 1983 Amendments to the Social Security Act restored fiscal solvency to social security and have reassured people that their benefits are safe. It seems very unwise to open up the question of benefit cuts again. Failure to keep social security benefits up to date with purchasing power would be particularly resented because OASDI is now adequately financed, and the benefit reduction clearly would be made solely for the purpose of reducing the overall deficit.

After a year of study, the National Commission on Social Security Reform, appointed jointly by the President and the Republican and Democratic leadership of the Congress, agreed on a set of recommendations which were endorsed by 12 of its 15 members. These recommendations became the basis for the 1983 Amendments to the Social Security Act.

No one who supported the plan liked all parts of it. There was some pain for every-

one involved in social security, but not too much for any one group:

Beneficiaries had the cost-of-living adjustment postponed and put permanently on a calendar year basis, a move which amounted to approximately a 2½ percent benefit cut over the average beneficiary's lifetime.

Contribution rate increases were speeded up for both workers and employers, with employers paying more than under previous law in 1984, 1988 and 1989 and employees paying more in 1988 and 1989.

The self-employed are now required to pay social security rates that are comparable to what is paid by, and on behalf of employees, a considerable increase over what they have been paying in the past.

Higher-income social security beneficiaries (less than 10 percent of all beneficiaries) will for the first time pay an income tax on one-half their social security benefits, with the proceeds of the tax going to support social security.

Those non-profit employees not previously covered (about 15 percent of the total) and newly hired Federal employees have been brought under the system, as have members of Congress and top officials of the Executive Branch.

The Federal Government speeded up its payment for military service credits and will pay for the refundable tax credit for employees in the year 1984 and for certain tax credits for the self-employed.

To bring the separately financed OASDI system into balance, agreement was struck among many diverse interests. To now impose additional sacrifice on one group—beneficiaries—is a violation of that agreement.

8. Keeping benefits up to date with the full cost of living makes sense.

Since the amendments of 1972, the purchasing power of social security benefits has been protected against inflation. The provision was adopted as a conservative measure because its sponsors believed that an automatic provision for meeting increases in the cost of living would tend to prevent ad hoc benefit increases and other expensive changes in the program that went beyond keeping the benefits up to date with price changes. It has turned out to be one of the most valuable provisions in the social security program.

It makes sense to decide on the proper level of benefits that people should get at the time of first receipt, and then to maintain the purchasing power of that benefit. It doesn't make sense to provide a given level of benefits at the time of retirement or total disability, or to survivors on the death of a wage earner and then to let inflation cut the value of those benefits so that people in their seventies or eighties have less than when they retired.

CONCLUSION

After the turmoil of 1981 and 1982 social security is now doing just fine. Let's keep it that way.

SECTION IV—SOCIAL SECURITY

"A one-year freeze in Social Security benefits would have been tolerable. But reducing them by 2 percent a year for each of the next three years is grossly unfair and an ominous precedent. Holding down the cost-of-living adjustments year after year means that retired people get poorer as they get older."—The Washington Post Editorial, April 7, 1985.

The most controversial proposal in the new Reagan/Republican budget calls for a reduction in the annual cost-of-living ad-

justment (COLA) for Social Security. The proposal is controversial because it would produce even larger cutbacks in Social Security than the COLA freeze adopted by the Senate Budget Committee; because it would have an especially harsh effect on many low-income people; and because it represents abandonment of the promise President Reagan made repeatedly during the 1984 campaign.

The proposed COLA reduction would cut Social Security spending by \$3.0 billion in fiscal year 1986 and a total of \$22.7 billion over the three-year period fiscal year 1986 through fiscal year 1988, compared to the amounts needed to maintain the benefits mandated by current law.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

The new Reagan/Republican proposal would essentially reduce the COLA by two percentage points per year over the next three years, but with a minimum 2 percent COLA guaranteed regardless of the inflation rate. If the Administration's inflation projections prove accurate, this proposal would cut the COLA roughly in half.

Specifically, President Reagan and the Senate Republicans propose to set the annual Social Security COLA at 2 percent for each of the next three years, provided that inflation does not exceed the rates currently projected by the Administration (4.1 percent in fiscal year 1986, 4.3 percent in fiscal year 1987, and 4.1 percent in fiscal year 1988). If actual inflation exceeds these projections, and additional increase equal to the excess of actual over projected inflation would be added to the basic 2 percent COLA.

For example, if inflation is 4.1 percent next year (the rate projected by the Administration) the COLA would be 2 percent. If inflation is 5 percent the COLA would be 2.9 percent (the basic 2 percent plus 0.9 percent for the excess of actual over expected inflation). If inflation is only 3 percent, the COLA would be 2 percent.

The "guaranteed COLA" issue

President Reagan and other Republicans have sought to portray their COLA proposal as a benefit liberalization, since their plan would provide a guaranteed 2 percent COLA regardless of the inflation rate, whereas under current law no COLA is provided in years when inflation falls below 3 percent. It should be noted, however, that current law merely delays the COLA in such circumstances, rather than canceling it, with a catch-up increase provided once inflation rises above the 3 percent threshold. Thus, while current law contains the possibility of a temporary COLA delay, the Reagan/Republican proposal contains the virtual certainty of the permanent cancellation of part of the COLA due in each of the next three years.

In addition, the Republicans' guaranteed COLA would only provide protection against a largely hypothetical possibility. Neither the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), nor private forecasters currently expect the inflation rate to fall below the 3 percent threshold that would trigger a Social Security COLA delay during the next three years.

EFFECT ON BENEFICIARIES

Based on Administration assumptions, the new Reagan/Republican proposal would reduce Social Security benefits by 1.9 percent in fiscal year 1986 and 5.7 percent in fiscal year 1988, compared to the benefits

that would be received under current law. This reduction would cost the average recipient \$81 in fiscal year 1986, \$198 in fiscal year 1987, and \$314 in fiscal year 1988, according to an analysis by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

By the time the three-year COLA reduction specified by the new budget compromise is fully phased-in, it would cost beneficiaries almost 50 percent more than the one-year COLA freeze originally approved by the Senate Budget Committee. By fiscal year 1988, the one-year COLA freeze would reduce benefits 3.9 percent below the levels mandated by current law, compared to the 5.7 percent benefit cut under the new Republican plan.

Impact on the poor

Of particular concern is the effect of the proposed COLA reduction on low-income beneficiaries, many of whom are heavily dependent on income from Social Security and related programs. For example, CBO estimates that Social Security (along with Railroad Retirement) provides 82 percent of total income for elderly recipient families classified as poor, and 79 percent of total income for elderly recipient families classified as near poor (that is, with incomes less than 25 percent above the poverty line). In addition, Social Security is a very important source of income for many low-income persons who are not elderly but who are disabled, orphaned, or widows or widowers caring for children.

The Republicans propose to partially alleviate this problem by increasing benefits under the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program—which provides cash assistance to aged, blind, or disabled people with very low incomes. Many poor people affected by the COLA cut do not receive SSI, however, partially because of the stringent income and assets tests required to qualify, and partially because some otherwise eligible people are evidently reluctant to seek what they perceive to be "welfare" benefits.

CBO estimates that the SSI benefit increase would offset the COLA reduction for only about one-third of the poor families affected, and for less than one-fifth of the near poor families affected. Even with the SSI benefit increase, CBO calculates that an estimated 2.9 million poor families will suffer a net loss (averaging \$200 per year) and that another 1.9 million near poor families will suffer a net loss (averaging \$280 per year). Further, according to CBO, the net effect of the COLA reduction and SSI benefit increase would be to increase the number of people living in poverty by 570,000—380,000 of whom are elderly.*

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S PROMISES

The proposed cutbacks in Social Security cost-of-living adjustments have become particularly controversial because they represent abandonment of firm promises made by President Reagan during the 1984 campaign to oppose any cuts in Social Security benefits.

Further, the Administration is hardly in a position to argue that these cuts were forced on the President by Senate Republicans. As noted above, the Social Security cuts contained in the new Reagan/Republican compromise are considerably deeper

than those proposed by the Senate Budget Committee. What's more, White House chief of staff Donald Regan has told the press that it was he who suggested the three-year COLA cutback, and that he made this proposal "on behalf of the President."

Incredibly, when asked by the press whether the Democrats would "beat up on him" for breaking his campaign promises, the President responded, "Well, if they do they'll be lying in their teeth."

The following page contains examples of some of the statements made last year by President Reagan and his press secretary pledging to preserve full Social Security benefits.

"I will never stand for a reduction of the Social Security benefits to the people that are now getting them . . ."—President Reagan, Presidential Debate, October 7, 1984.

"The President will never stand for reduction of Social Security benefits for anybody."—White House Deputy Press Secretary Larry Speakes, October 9, 1984.

Deputy Press Secretary Larry Speakes was asked: "You say that benefits will not be reduced. The law includes a provision for increases in benefits based on cost of living. Does this guarantee those increases as well?" Speakes answered: "Yes. The law is the law."—White House Briefing, October 9, 1984.

"We're never going to take away from those people who are dependent on Social Security, now or in the future."—President Reagan, October 10, 1984.

"I will absolutely battle against any suggestion of reducing or taking the benefits these people on Social Security are getting. . . . They're going to get those benefits the way they are."—President Reagan, October 12, 1984.

"I made it plain that I would never hold still for any change in Social Security that pulled the rug out from the people that were depending on it."—President Reagan, October 16, 1984.

"The President has made it emphatic that he will not touch Social Security in any shape or fashion."—White House Deputy Press Secretary Larry Speakes, December 6, 1984.

[Center on Budget and Policy Priorities]
AVERAGE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARY TO
LOSE \$1,667 OVER 5 YEARS UNDER NEW
WHITE HOUSE BUDGET
LOW INCOME PROGRAMS TO BE CUT \$25 BILLION
OVER NEXT 3 YEARS

The average Social Security beneficiary would lose \$1,667 over the next five years under the new budget plan announced by President Reagan and Senate Republican leaders last week, according to a new analysis by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

The losses would come from reductions in Social Security cost-of-living adjustments and increases in the monthly premiums charged to elderly Medicare beneficiaries.

The analysis also finds that the new budget would also reduce programs for low income persons by \$25 billion over the next three years—\$4.6 billion in FY 1986, \$8.7 billion in FY 1987, and \$11.4 billion in FY 1988.

The largest reductions in the low income area would come from the elimination of rural housing programs for low income persons and major reductions in Medicaid, the analysis reports. The cuts over the next three years in Medicaid would be five times larger under the new White House/Republican

can budget than under the budget plan adopted last month by the Senate Budget Committee.

The analysis is based on budget estimates from the Senate Budget Committee and the Office of Management and Budget.

Social Security reductions

The analysis reports that reductions in Social Security benefits would, for 1988 and all succeeding years, be larger than those adopted in March by the Senate Budget Committee.

The Budget Committee proposal to freeze Social Security cost-of-living adjustments for one year would reduce benefits by \$8.1 billion in 1988 and subsequent years, the analysis notes. But while the new budget plan reduces benefits less than the Senate plan in 1986, by 1988 it represents a \$12.1 billion a year reduction.

"Over the course of time, beneficiaries would lose substantially more under this plan than under the Committee plan," according to the analysis. "This is because the Budget Committee plan reduced benefits about 4 percent by canceling the 1986 cost-of-living reduction. By contrast, the new plan cuts benefits about 6 percent for 1988 and subsequent years—by lowering the cost-of-living adjustment 2 percent next year, an additional 2 percent in 1987, and a further 2 percent in 1988."

The average Social Security loss per beneficiary reaches \$314 by 1988 and at least \$1,257 over the next five years, the Center reported.

The new budget plan also raises the monthly premiums that elderly persons must pay for Medicare coverage. These premiums are subtracted from monthly Social Security checks—and as a result, the checks will fall still further behind inflation, according to the Center.

In 1988, the average elderly Social Security beneficiary will lose \$385 from these Social Security and Medicare changes combined, the Center noted. In 1990, the average loss will reach \$512.

Over the next five years, the average cumulative loss from both Social Security and Medicare will be \$1,667 per beneficiary.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities is a nonprofit research and analysis organization supported primarily by foundations.

HURTING THOSE WHO NEED HELP THE MOST (By William V. Shannon)

The budget "compromise" worked out by President Reagan and the Senate Republican leaders is as morally despicable as anything that has come out of Washington in the last four years.

Along a trail of broken promises and political doubletalk, Reagan is once again on the attack against old-age pensioners, the needy sick, hard-pressed farmers, unemployed teenagers and college students from working-class families. Programs that help make our inner cities livable for the poor such as mass transit, low-income housing and general revenue-sharing would be sharply reduced or canceled.

All this is being done in the name of reducing the deficit. The theory is that the deficit, which is now \$213 billion, could be brought below \$100 billion by 1988.

There are two things wrong with this theory. The first is that it does not fit the facts. In February, the Congressional Budget Office, using more cautious, and therefore probably more accurate, assumptions about economic growth and interest

*These CBO estimates all include the effects of the proposed COLA reduction for Federal civilian and military retirement and Railroad Retirement, as well as for Social Security. These estimates are based on Administration inflation assumptions and 1983 income levels; dollar losses are stated in 1983 dollars.

rates, forecast that even if Congress approved all the Reagan spending cuts the annual federal budget deficit would remain around \$185 billion for the rest of the 1980s.

The second falsehood underlying this compromise is that cuts in spending could ever bring the budget into balance. As fast as those cuts are being made, the money saved by them is being used up by the higher-interest payments on the rising national debt.

The reckless Reagan tax cut of 1981 produced these huge budget deficits. Only a substantial tax increase can bring them back to a manageable size. The 1981 act reduced federal government revenue for the five years from 1982 through 1987 by \$750 billion. If the old 1981 rates were still in effect, the current deficit would be reduced by two-thirds. The remaining one-third is accounted for by Reagan's increases in military spending.

The Reagan tax reduction and the accompanying budget was not an economically or morally neutral act. It was an economically unnecessary and monstrously unjust transfer of wealth from the poorest, weakest, most vulnerable people in our society to the strongest and the richest.

In thinking about the Reagan budget compromise in coming months, the public should keep one text in mind. It is from William Greider's "The Education of David Stockman" in the Atlantic Monthly of December 1981 in which Reagan's chief budget adviser is described after the tax-cutting orgy of that year.

"It seemed to leave a bad taste in his mouth, as though the Democratic process had finally succeeded in shocking him by its intensity and its greed. Once again, Stockman participated in the trading—special tax concessions for oil-lease holders and real estate tax shelters, and generous loopholes that virtually eliminated the corporate income tax. Stockman sat in the room and saw it happen.

"Do you realize the greed that came to the forefront?" Stockman asked with wonder. "The hogs were really feeding. The greed level, the level of opportunism, just got out of control."

To trim the deficits created by this hog-gishness, Reagan, Stockman and the Senate Republican leaders have been squeezing food stamps for the marginally poor and eliminating public-service jobs for the marginally employable. Now, as part of their latest "compromise," they propose to take another whack at the old-age pensioners. The elderly would have to pay more for their Medicare protection. They would also have their cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) restricted to 2 percent.

Many forget that as part of the 1983 bipartisan agreement that put the Social Security system on a financially sound basis for the immediate future, pensioners had to accept a "one time only" COLA delay for six months. That was not just a postponement; it was a perpetual reduction in benefits because each subsequent cost-of-living adjustment is based on one's existing benefit level. Once a step on the escalator is lost, it cannot be regained.

How well off are these old people who Reagan has chosen to make fresh sacrifices? The large majority of people over 65 have incomes between \$4,000 and \$15,000. Single retirees (mostly widows) have a median monthly benefit below \$450. Anyone here want to volunteer to pay his own rent, fuel bills, telephone bill, and food and clothing costs on \$450 a month?

(William V. Shannon is a contributing columnist.)

● Mr. OBERSTAR, Madam Speaker, Just 6 months ago, President Reagan, as well as the overwhelming majority of candidates for the House and Senate promised the American people that they would not support further cuts in Social Security.

The 1983 amendments strengthened the Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Trust Funds by accelerating tax increases, delaying cost-of-living adjustments, and ignoring a 2.4 percent change in the consumer price index. There is no financial justification for cutting benefits to present or future retirees. The trust funds are not in trouble today, they are accumulating surpluses.

The only significant change which has occurred since last fall is that the elections are behind us.

My colleagues here have discussed the adverse impact of a 2-percent per year COLA reduction on today's annuitants. I want to discuss the fairness issue for workers age 59 through 64 who are still in the work force.

Substantial benefit reductions for future retirees were made in 1977 when the flawed benefit formula of the 1972 amendments was corrected. A new 1977 benefit computation formula was designed so that a worker with average wages throughout his worklife would receive, at age 65, a benefit equal to 42 percent of preretirement income. That goal was to be achieved by averaging indexed lifetime earnings up to age 62 and then applying all cost-of-living adjustments granted after the worker reached age 62.

If Congress approved the budget agreement recently worked out between the Senate Republicans and the White House, workers reaching age 62 this year—will have their benefits reduced by 6.5 percent and will retire at age 65 with approximately 40.1 percent of preretirement income. Individuals reaching age 62 in either 1984 or 1986 will have their full entitlement reduced by 4.25 percent; workers reaching 62 in 1983 or 1987 will face a 2-percent reduction in the benefit which would otherwise be payable.

The proposed Senate Republican—Reagan administration budget will worsen the notch effect we have all heard so much about for those born in 1921 and create another notch for those born between 1922 and 1925.

More important, for those born in 1923, who reach age 62 this year, we will have come halfway to the administration's aborted 1981 Social Security proposals which had as their objective a reduction in benefits to only 38 percent of preretirement income for average wage earners.

The oldest of our retirees cannot afford to absorb a cumulative 6.5 percent reduction in their purchasing power because they are least likely to

have resources to supplement Social Security annuities. Yet, comparatively, the oldest retirees are taking the smallest cut because younger retirees and workers close to retirement age will receive reduced benefits for longer periods of time.

Prior to 1972 when cost-of-living adjustments were put on automatic pilot, increases were granted periodically to insure that retirees would benefit from the increased productivity of the active work force. The chief criticism of those sporadic increases was that the Congress was overreacting to political pressures and granting increases related to wage increases that were greater than price increases, and that retirees were being over-compensated.

The automatic increase provisions was to keep retirees even with inflation. Never before in the history of the Social Security Program, however, has Congress set out to systematically reduce the purchasing power of the Nation's elderly by stipulating that benefits will be kept below price increases.

If Congress votes to reduce or freeze Social Security benefits, the effect will be to blame the old, the sick, the poor, and make them pay for excessive military expenditures and inappropriate tax reductions granted in 1981. That budget policy cannot and will not serve the long-range best interests of this Nation.●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order on today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MIKULSKI (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BADHAM (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BATEMAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCKINNEY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. LUNGREN, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. SWINDALL, for 20 minutes, today.
 Mr. KEMP, for 15 minutes, today.
 Mr. MYERS of Indiana, for 60 minutes, today.
 Mr. STRANG, for 60 minutes, today.
 Mr. DORNAN of California, for 60 minutes, today.
 Mr. BARTLETT, for 60 minutes, today.
 Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, for 30 minutes, April 30.
 Mr. DORNAN of California, for 10 minutes, April 30.
 Mr. HENDON, for 60 minutes, April 30.
 Mr. GILMAN, for 60 minutes, May 1.
 Mr. BROYHILL, for 60 minutes, May 6.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EVANS of Illinois) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MOAKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. NELSON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. BUSTAMANTE, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. LEVINE of California, for 60 minutes, today.
 Mr. FRANK, for 60 minutes, today.
 Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.
 Mr. MOODY, for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BATEMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COMBEST.
 Mr. DREIER of California.
 Mr. COURTER in two instances.
 Mr. LOTT.
 Mr. BARTLETT.
 Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.
 Mr. CONTE in two instances.
 Mr. FIELDS.
 Mr. MICHEL in four instances.
 Ms. SNOWE.
 Mr. WOLF.
 Mr. McDADE.
 Mr. GROTEBERG.
 Mr. BROOMFIELD in three instances.
 Mr. LENT.
 Mr. MYERS of Indiana.
 Mr. STANGELAND.
 Mr. DAUB.
 Mr. COUGHLIN.
 Mr. BEREUTER.
 Mr. McGRATH.
 Mr. THOMAS of California.
 Mr. GRADISON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EVANS of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STUDDS in two instances.
 Mr. GAYDOS.
 Mr. WIRTH.
 Mr. HOYER.
 Mr. NOWAK.
 Mr. LIPINSKI.
 Mr. ERDREICH.
 Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.
 Mr. FUQUA.
 Mr. HUCKABY.
 Mr. GUARINI in two instances.
 Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.
 Mr. FLORIO.
 Mr. MOODY.
 Mr. WILLIAMS.
 Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia in two instances.
 Mrs. LONG.
 Mr. BIAGGI.
 Mr. TRAFICANT.
 Mr. WAXMAN.
 Mr. STALLINGS.
 Ms. KAPTUR.
 Mr. KANJORSKI.
 Mr. GARCIA.
 Mr. ROYBAL.
 Mr. FORD of Michigan.
 Mr. MATSUI.
 Mr. BONKER.
 Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.
 Mr. APLEGATE.
 Mr. COELHO.
 Mr. MURTHA.
 Mrs. SCHROEDER.
 Mr. TORRES.
 Mr. REID.
 Mr. BEDELL.
 Mr. BARNARD.
 Mr. BARNES.
 Mr. RODINO.
 Mr. YATRON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.
 Mr. BONER of Tennessee in five instances.
 Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.
 Mr. ANNUNZIO in 10 instances.
 Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution designating the month of May 1985, as "National Child Safety Awareness Month."

Date April 25, 1985

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 30, 1985, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under Clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1135. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed amendment to the fiscal year 1986 military construction authorization bill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1136. A letter from the Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the sixth report on applications for delays of notice and customer challenges under provisions of the Right To Financial Privacy Act of 1978, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 3421; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1137. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting a copy of final regulations for chapter 1, Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981; Financial Assistance to State Educational Agencies To Meet Special Educational Needs of Migratory Children, and Neglected or Delinquent Children in Institutions, and General Definitions and Administrative, Project, Fiscal, and Due Process Requirements, pursuant to GEPA, section 431(A)(1) (88 Stat. 567; 90 Stat. 2231; 95 Stat. 453); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1138. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting a copy of notice for final funding priorities for Handicapped Special Studies Program, pursuant to GEPA, section 431(d)(1) (88 Stat. 567; 90 Stat. 2231; 95 Stat. 453); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1139. A letter from the Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the annual report on application for court orders made to Federal and State courts to permit the interception of wire or oral communications during calendar year 1984, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519(3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1140. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to make permanent a reform in the method used for computing pay for Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1141. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notice of the intent to designate 32 countries as least developed beneficiary developing countries, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2464(c)(6)(B)(ii) (H. Doc. No. 99-60); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1142. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the U.S. Customs Service for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1143. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the annual report for fiscal year 1984 covering the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Oil and Gas Leasing and Production Program administered by the Department of the Interior through the Minerals Management Service, pursuant to the act of August 7, 1953, chapter 345, section 15(1) (92 Stat. 648); jointly, to the Committees on Interior and

Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PANETTA: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 146. Resolution relating to election of a Representative from the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana. (Rept. No. 99-58). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1784. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 2250. A bill to authorize appropriations for the U.S. International Trade Commission, the U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 2251. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs under title VII of that act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Mr. MADIGAN):

H.R. 2252. A bill to revise and extend the programs of assistance under title X of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUNDINE (for himself, Mr. LaFALCE, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2253. A bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the special facility for sub-Saharan Africa, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, and the African Development Fund; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

H.R. 2254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit small businesses to reduce the value of excess inventory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNEY of New York (for himself, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. ECKART of Ohio):

H.R. 2255. A bill to provide that the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 will apply to certain petroleum and to establish a separate account in the Superfund for leaking underground storage tanks; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 2256. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide assistance for State clearinghouses for information relating to missing children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORD of Tennessee:

H.R. 2257. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require information reporting with respect to airline passes provided under frequent flier or similar programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 2258. A bill to provide for a program of assisted higher education for individuals intending to engage in police work; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 2259. A bill relating to the establishment and disposition of customs districts and ports of entry, the provision of customs services on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii:

H.R. 2260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1953 to extend the energy percentage of the investment tax credit for qualified intercity buses to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii (for himself and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 2261. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the formation of physicians' and surgeons' mutual protection associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERTEL of Michigan:

H.R. 2262. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to take certain extraordinary actions regarding contracts of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2263. A bill to authorize the President to present a gold medal to the parents of Father Jerzy Popieluszko; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2264. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide civil penalties for false claims and statements made to the United States, to certain recipients of property, services, or money from the United States, or to parties to contracts with the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS (for himself and Mr. HOPKINS):

H.R. 2265. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to strengthen the position of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to provide for more efficient and effective operation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 2266. A bill authorizing appropriations for Amtrak for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, establishing a Commission to study the financial status of Amtrak, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire:

H.R. 2267. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to control immigration into the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT (for himself and Mr. MICHEL) (by request):

H.R. 2268. A bill to approve and implement the free trade area agreement between the United States and Israel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

H.J. Res. 263. Joint resolution designating June 14, 1985, as "Baltic Freedom Day"; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.J. Res. 264. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LELAND:

H.J. Res. 265. Joint resolution designating the month of June 1985, as "Black Music Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LUKEN (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Mrs. COLLINS):

H.J. Res. 266. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week beginning on April 13, 1986, as "National Garden Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire):

H.J. Res. 267. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that expenditures made by the United States shall not exceed its receipts, except in time of war or national emergency, and providing for its phased-in implementation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. MANTON, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. YATRON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. PRICE, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. GREEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. FISH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LENT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BARNES, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. COLLINS, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. McGRATH, and Mr. CHANDLER):

H. Con. Res. 132. Concurrent resolution observing the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H. Con. Res. 133. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that each State should develop a curriculum for instructing schoolchildren in the history of the Holocaust; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BONKER (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FRANK, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLECZ-

KA, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MINETA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PEASE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. GAYDOS).

H. Res. 147: Resolution urging the President to make the overvalued dollar, the growing U.S. trade deficit, and cooperative measures to redress these imbalances a top priority at the economic summit meeting in Bonn, West Germany; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Foreign Affairs, and Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

92. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona, relative to the civil liberties of Orthodox Christians living in Turkey; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

93. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma, relative to funding available to the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 43: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 52: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 68: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GRAY, of Pennsylvania, and Ms. OAKAR.

H.R. 83: Mr. PORTER and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

H.R. 151: Mr. PERKINS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 281: Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. FAZIO, and Ms. OAKAR.

H.R. 283: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GRAY, of Pennsylvania, Mr. MATSUI, and Ms. OAKAR.

H.R. 469: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 479: Mr. MONSON, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 480: Mr. ANDERSON.

H.R. 528: Mrs. ROUKEMA and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 602: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MONSON, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 620: Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

H.R. 705: Mr. GUARINI.

H.R. 753: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 776: Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 831: Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 873: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. WHITLEY, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MONSON, and Mr. LOEFFLER.

H.R. 874: Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 968: Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1059: Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 1099: Mr. HOWARD, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 1121: Mr. BONKER, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 1161: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1207: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. LEVINE of California, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MANTON, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1267: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 1294: Mr. OWENS and Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 1327: Mr. SUNIA, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. PRICE, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 1408: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 1423: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma and Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii.

H.R. 1519: Mr. YOUNG of Missouri and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 1524: Mr. GEPHARDT and Mrs. BURTON of California.

H.R. 1542: Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 1552: Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. ECKERT of New York, and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 1562: Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WISE, Mr. BARNES, and Mr. WOLFE.

H.R. 1564: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FROST, Mr. STRANG, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 1566: Mr. MONSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 1567: Mr. MONSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 1584: Mr. VENTO and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1626: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 1650: Mr. BARNES, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HEFTTEL of Michigan, Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. LaFALCE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. WIRTH.

H.R. 1682: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BEDELL, and Mrs. JOHNSON.

H.R. 1719: Mr. COBEY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. FRENZEL, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SHAW, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1907: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1911: Mr. WEBER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MONSON, Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 1916: Mr. McDADE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PRICE, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. WEBER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. COBEY, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. McGRATH.

H.R. 1927: Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 2032: Mr. SYNAR, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. LELAND, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 2069: Mr. LUEN, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. DYSON, Mr. RUDD, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ROE, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HOPKINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. MARTIN of New York.

H.R. 2080: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. HAYES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr.

McHUGH, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 2093: Mr. EDGAR.

H.R. 2119: Mr. DiOGUARDI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. HORTON, Mr. REID, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FISH, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. GREEN, Mr. WEISS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. HEFTTEL of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 36: Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ROE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FROST, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. DYMALLY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. STOKES, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.J. Res. 41: Mr. PANETTA.

H.J. Res. 64: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. COURTER, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. SUNIA.

H.J. Res. 65: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. DURBIN.

H.J. Res. 100: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FROST, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.J. Res. 125: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DiOGUARDI, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GROTSBERG, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HENDON, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HEFTTEL of Michigan, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. McKERNAN, Mr. MACK, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REID, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROGERS,

Mr. ROSE, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STRANG, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. COBEY, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. OLIN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. LATTI, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LENT, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. COBLE.

H.J. Res. 128: Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GREGG, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MONSON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. YATRON, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. CARR, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DYSON, Mr. FEIGHAN, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.J. Res. 131: Mrs. HOLT, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. BARNES, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.J. Res. 133: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and Mr. BATES.

H.J. Res. 136: Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DYSON, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.J. Res. 152: Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. LUNDINE.

H.J. Res. 192: Mrs. BOGGS and Mr. LEACH of Iowa.

H.J. Res. 230: Mr. GRADISON and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.J. Res. 258: Mrs. COLLINS, Mrs. ROUKE-MA, Mr. BARNES, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DAUB, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. McGRATH.

H.J. Res. 261: Mr. VENTO and Mr. DIOGUARDI.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. COYNE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SABO, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. STARK.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. WILSON, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. RAY, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H. Con. Res. 74: Mr. ECKART of Ohio and Mr. RITTER.

H. Con. Res. 82: Mr. DURBIN.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. DAUB, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H. Con. Res. 116: Mr. EDGAR, Mr. SAVAGE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri.

H. Con. Res. 121: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. REID, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. MANTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. WEISS, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. RUSSO, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. COELHO, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CARR, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mrs. COLLINS.

H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. DYSON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. MOORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. RUDD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. McGRATH.

H. Con. Res. 125: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FROST, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. MARKEY.

H. Con. Res. 131: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. DAUB, and Mr. HUGHES.

H. Res. 60: Mr. PEASE.

H. Res. 67: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

H. Res. 112: Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. LUNGREN.

H. Res. 127: Mr. KRAMER, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. PRICE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. McDADDE, Mr. LUJAN, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. THOMAS of California, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H. Res. 135: Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. BARNES, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. STOKES.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1612: Mr. ANDERSON.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1555

By Mr. LEACH of Iowa:

—Page 30, line 17, strike out "\$3,900,400,000" both places it appears and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,895,400,000".

Page 36, strike out lines 15 through 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following new section:

SEC. 206. HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FOR THE NONCOMMUNIST CAMBODIAN PEOPLE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The President may make available funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of chapter 1 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the provision of food, medicine, or other humanitarian assistance to the noncommunist Cambodian people, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall remain in effect until October 1, 1987.

H.R. 2068

By Mr. SOLOMON:

—Page 2, line 15, strike out "\$543,574,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$491,222,800".

Page 2, line 16, strike out "\$572,519,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$520,167,800".